THE DOCTRINE

OF

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

ON THE

HOLY COMMUNION

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

SCRIPTURAL AND CATHOLIC TRUTH AND WORSHIP; OR, THE FAITH AND WORSHIP OF THE PRIMITIVE, THE MEDIÆVAL AND THE REFORMED ANGLICAN CHURCHES. New Edition, 1908. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

OLD ANGLICANISM AND MODERN RITUALISM. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE. 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE CONFESSIONAL. 3*d.*

RITUAL AND RITUALISM. A Popular Catechism. Fourteenth Thousand. 2*d.*

LONDON:
6 GROSVENOR MANSIONS, 82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.

THE DOCTRINE

OF

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

ON THE

HOLY COMMUNION

RESTATED AS A GUIDE AT THE PRESENT TIME

BY THE REV. CANON

F. MEYRICK, M.A.

SOMETIME FELLOW AND TUTOR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

WITH A PREFACE BY THE RIGHT REV.

EDWARD HAROLD BROWNE, D.D.

LATE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER

NEW EDITION

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

1908

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

First Edition, August, 1885
Second Edition, February, 1888
Third Edition, November, 1891
Fourth Edition, December, 1898
New Edition, June, 1908

PREFACE
TO THE FOURTH EDITION

THE present edition is issued at a moment when controversy is very rife on the subject-matter of the book. I think it an advantage, rather than otherwise that the book was not composed in the midst of an abnormal excitement, but at a time when it was easier to make a calm review and restatement of the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Holy Communion. I trust that such a review and restatement may have a tranquillizing effect, by showing what is the Church of England's real teaching—distinct on the one side from the so-called Zuinglian view, which does not adequately recognize the Holy Communion as a means of conveying grace, and, on the other side, from the Roman view, which confounds the Memorial with the thing commemorated, and looks for the Presence of Christ in the inanimate offering of homage made to God out of His creatures rather than in His faithful people. The formula expressive of the Church of England's doctrine is the Spiritual Presence, which (1)

recognises Christ's Presence in or through the ordinance, and (2) denies a presence in the elements—teaching that the bread and wine, symbolizing the Body and Blood, must be received with faith in order to serve as a means of conveying grace—and that so received they do convey grace—to the soul, as it lovingly recalls the Sacrifice of the death of Christ and the benefits flowing from the Body broken and the Blood poured out upon the Cross. The Church of Rome teaches that the elements are Christ; the Lutheran Church, that they contain Christ; the Anglican Church, that they are a Divinely appointed means, which, if properly used, enable the faithful Christian to receive Christ in his soul, and there feed upon Him. Hooker's teaching has been too much obscured of late by manuals borrowed from or based upon Roman originals, which teach doctrines compatible only with the tenets of Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass, and leading up to them by logical sequence. Hooker represents the "Popish construction" of the words "This is my body" to be, "This is itself and before participation the very true and natural substance of my Body by force of that Deity which with the words of consecration abolisheth the substance of bread and substituteth in the place thereof my Body;" the "Lutheran's interpretation" to be, "This is in itself before participation really and truly the natural substance of my Body by reason of the co-existence which my omnipotent Body hath with the sanctified element of bread;" the remaining, or Anglican, ex-

position to be, "This hallowed food, through concurrence of Divine power, is in verity and truth, unto faithful receivers, *instrumentally a cause of* that mystical *participation*, whereby as I make myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as my sacrificed Body can yield and as their souls do presently need; this is to them and in them my Body." He makes the Anglican position still clearer by the following words, never to be forgotten or made light of by English Churchmen, "The Real Presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. . . . I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ *when* and *where* the bread is His Body or the cup His Blood, *but only* in the very heart and soul of him that receiveth them." It should not be forgotten that the three points which, more than others, distinguish Roman from Anglican teaching, are: the doctrine of Justification, the doctrine and practice of Mariolatry, and the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass involving that of Transubstantiation.

F. MEYRICK.

BLICKLING RECTORY,
December 14, 1898.

PREFACE

THE great central act of worship, the great bond of union and fellowship in the Early Church, was Holy Communion. It told of Christ and of God's love in Him; it gave fellowship in and participation of Christ, and through Him it knit together in one all members of His mystical Body—one with Him, and so one with each other. It was therefore the great Sunday service, ministered every Lord's day at least, and round it gathered all other worship and all other teaching (see Acts ii. 46; xx. 7; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17; Justin M. Apol. i. p. 98). Why has it become in later days a feast at which few are gathered, and from the bond of union a battle-field of strife? The primitive Christians were content to believe that the bread was no longer common bread, nor the wine common wine, but that mysteriously they were the means of conveying Christ to the Christian; the communion or participation (*κοινωνία*) of His Body, and the communion or participation of His Blood (1 Cor. x. 16; Justin M. Apol. i. p. 98). Later ages were not satisfied to believe,

they must also inquire how Christ could be present, and how received by His people. The belief in a carnal presence—that the elements become, in everything except appearance, Christ's Body and Blood—was an obvious error for popular acceptance. Philosophy invented a subtler explanation, teaching that while everything that makes bread to be bread continued unchanged, there was an intangible (we may almost call it a spiritual) substance beneath, which ceased to be the substance of bread, and became the substance of Christ. Reasoning minds revolted from the extreme credulity of the multitude, and from the theory of what has proved to be an unsound Philosophy, and fell back on a mere memorial, not a mystical presence, but "a bare sign, an untrue figure of a thing absent" (Homily concerning the Sacrament). It has been ever the boast of the English Church that in her Reformation she in nothing departed from the principles of the Church Catholic, but only swept away novelties, and returned as nearly as possible to primitive faith and practice. Whatever is unknown to Scripture and to the Church of the earliest centuries, is unknown to her. Hence she rejected and rejects not only popular superstition, but also the pseudo-philosophical theory of Transubstantiation and the rationalizing theory of the followers of Zuinglius. There have been learned and able advocates of both these theories. There could not but arise contention and disunion from their controversy. Untenable positions and the strife of tongues tend to

alienate from the truth those whose faith is feeble, and who, as in the present day, are surrounded by scepticism and unbelief. Hence a clear exposition of primitive doctrine, and of the doctrine of that Church which glories in reverting to and taking hold of primitive faith, must be useful to puzzled consciences, may assure those who are in doubt, and may also help to the reuniting of the scattered members of Christ's divided Body. On these grounds it is that I venture to commend the following treatise, which has gathered into a small compass and expressed in simple language the results of intelligent study, of patient thought, and of extensive learning.

E. H. WINTON.

FARNHAM CASTLE,
August, 1885.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER VII.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHAPTER IX.

CHAPTER X.

CHAPTER XI.

CHAPTER XII.

CHAPTER XIII.

CHAPTER XIV.

CHAPTER XV.

CHAPTER XVI.

CHAPTER XVII.

CHAPTER XVIII.

CHAPTER XIX.

CHAPTER XX.

CHAPTER XXI.

CHAPTER XXII.

CHAPTER XXIII.

CHAPTER XXIV.

CHAPTER XXV.

CHAPTER XXVI.

CHAPTER XXVII.

CHAPTER I.

I PROPOSE in the following pages to state what I believe to be the doctrine of the Church of England in reference to the Holy Communion. I propose to touch, one after the other, on all the points connected with it that are at present under discussion amongst us; but in doing so I shall seek to avoid everything like the heat or harshness of controversy, and I will add that, in stating what I hold to be the doctrine of the Church of England, I shall express also my own personal belief. The order in which I shall deal with the different questions that arise will be rather that suggested by the Prayer-book of the Church of England than by the controversies and disputes of the present day.

From the Catechism, the Communion Service, and the Articles, we may gather that, according to the mind of the Church of England, the Holy Communion is: I. A remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. II. In some sense itself a sacrifice. III. A means of feeding upon Christ. IV. A means of incorporation with Christ and of union with the other members of His mystical Body. V. An assurance to ourselves, and a manifestation to others, that we are Christ's. That these are the truths emphasized by the Church of England is shown by the following extracts from her formularies:—

I. The Remembrance. On this point I quote from the Catechism: "Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained? For the continual *remembrance* of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby." "What is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper? . . . A thankful *remembrance* of Christ's death." From the first warning in the Communion Service: "I purpose, through God's assistance, to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; to be by them received in *remembrance* of His meritorious Cross and Passion, whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the Kingdom of heaven." From the second warning in the same Service: "As the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up His soul by death upon the Cross for our salvation; so it is your duty to receive the Communion in *remembrance* of the sacrifice of His death, as He Himself hath commanded." In the First Exhortation at the time of the celebration of the Communion we find, "To the end that we should alway *remember* the exceeding great love of our Master, and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood-shedding He hath obtained to us; He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love, and for a continual *remembrance* of His death, to our great and endless comfort." In the Prayer of Consecration: "Who did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual *memory* of that His precious death, until His coming again . . . grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in

remembrance of His death and Passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood." In the form of Reception: "Take and eat this in *remembrance* that Christ died for thee. . . . Drink this in *remembrance* that Christ's Blood was shed for thee." In the Articles: "Christ came to be the Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world." "The Supper of the Lord is . . . a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death" (Arts. XV., XXVIII.).

What is meant by the word "remembrance" in the passages where it occurs above—whether it signifies, as some maintain, a memorial before God, or as others, a reminder to man—is a question which we defer for the present; all that we are here concerned with is, that the Church of England places the Remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ as the first end and object with which the Holy Communion was instituted.

II. Besides being a remembrance of the great sacrifice, it is in some sense a sacrifice itself. Thus in the prayer which is now found in the post-Communion, there occur the words: "We Thy humble servants entirely desire Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our *sacrifice* of praise and thanksgiving." And again: "Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively *sacrifice* unto Thee." And once more: "Although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any *sacrifice*, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service." In this connection there will also have to be considered the rubric, which orders an offertory to be made, and desires the alms for the poor and other devotions of the people to

be reverently brought to the priest, who shall humbly present and place them upon the holy table; and the next succeeding rubric, which desires that the priest shall then place upon the table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient; and the words, "Accept our alms, and oblations," in the Prayer for the Church Militant. In what sense the Holy Communion is, and in what sense it is not, a sacrifice, will have to be hereafter elicited.

III. The Church of England also teaches that the Holy Communion is an appointed means whereby the Christian is enabled to feed upon Christ. In the Catechism we find, "What are the benefits whereof we are partakers by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are (strengthened and refreshed) by the Bread and Wine." And again: "What is the inward part of the Lord's Supper? The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." In the first warning in the Communion Service: "It is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that He hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual *food and sustenance* in that Holy Sacrament." In the second warning: "Consider with yourselves how great injury ye do unto God, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same, when ye wilfully abstain from the Lord's Table, and separate from your brethren, who come to feed on the banquet of that *most heavenly food*." In the First Exhortation, at the time of the celebration of the Communion: "If with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacra-

ment, we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood." In the Prayer of Humble Access: "Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood." In the Prayer of Consecration: "Grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, . . . may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood." In the form of Reception: "*Feed* on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." In the Thanksgiving Prayer in the post-Communion: "We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the *spiritual food* of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ." In the Articles: "Sacraments are effectual signs of grace. . . . Insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. . . . The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith" (Arts. XXV., XXVIII.).

How this feeding on Christ is effected—whether by the elements being changed into His Body and Blood, or by His Body and Blood being united to the elements, or by their objective presence in the elements, or by the spiritual presence of Christ in the soul—will have to be hereafter considered.

IV. The Holy Communion is also a means whereby we are more and more incorporated with Christ, and united

with the other members of His mystical Body. Thus in the First Exhortation we read, "If with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament, . . . then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us." In the Prayer of Humble Access: "Grant us so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, . . . that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us." In the Prayer of Thanksgiving in the post-Communion: "That we are very members incorporate in the mystical Body of Thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people."

V. The Holy Communion also serves as a pledge that we are Christ's, and Christ is ours. According to the Catechism, one of the characteristics of a Sacrament is to be "a pledge to assure us" of receiving the grace attached to the Sacrament. In the First Exhortation the "holy mysteries" are said to have been "instituted and ordained" by Christ as "pledges of His love." In the post-Communion Prayer we thank God "for that Thou dost assure us," by permitting us to receive these holy mysteries, "of Thy favour and goodness towards us."

Under one or other of the heads, Remembrance, Sacrifice, Feeding, Incorporation, Pledge, all the questions at present under discussion will be found to range themselves.

CHAPTER II.

THE primary end and object of the institution of the Lord's Supper was "the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ." What does the word "remembrance" here signify?

At the institution of the rite we find that our Lord, after giving the bread, said to His disciples, "Do this in remembrance of Me" (Luke xxii. 19); and after giving them the cup, He said, "Do this, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me" (1 Cor. xi. 25). What did He mean by remembrance?

The Greek word employed by the Evangelist and the Apostle (*ἀνάμνησις*) as the equivalent of the Aramaic word used by our Lord, has exactly the same force as our English word "remembrance," by which it is rendered; and, like it, includes three ideas closely connected with each other, but not absolutely identical. These are: (1) Remembrance; (2) Commemoration; (3) Memorial.

1. The first object, then, with which the Holy Communion was instituted, was that it might serve as a means of keeping the Master's memory fresh in the minds of His disciples during the many centuries which were to elapse before He came to them in bodily presence.

If we notice the circumstances under which the rite was established, we shall see how natural it is that Remembrance

should be the first thought connected with it. The Lord and His disciples were eating the solemn Paschal Supper—the last Paschal Supper, properly speaking, that ever was eaten—the significance of which the Master knew to be now exhausted. The object of this Paschal Supper was Remembrance. Fifteen hundred years ago the great event had taken place which delivered the Israelites from the bondage of Egypt, and constituted them a free nation; and that great deliverance had been signalized by a special mercy shown to the Israelites, who were saved from the death of their first-born on their exhibiting the blood of the Paschal lamb on the lintel and side-posts of the doors of their houses. This deliverance was never to be forgotten. "This day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever. . . . And it shall come to pass, when ye be come to the land which the Lord will give you, according as He hath promised, that ye shall keep this service. And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when He smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses" (Ex. xii. 14, 25-27). Accordingly, for fifteen hundred years the Paschal feast was kept; each year the Paschal lamb and unleavened bread and bitter herbs were eaten, and four cups of wine were solemnly drunk; and each year, in each company, the youngest member present inquired, "What mean ye by this service?" And the president of the feast replied that it was a commemoration of the Egyptian Passover, explaining why they feasted on the body

of a lamb, and ate the unleavened bread and bitter herbs, and calling on all the company to give thanks for what God had wrought for them and for their fathers. Thus the Remembrance of the great deliverance was kept fresh and green in each generation as though it had taken place but yesterday.

It was this solemn feast that our Lord was eating with His Apostles. He had eaten of the body of the lamb, which was commemorative of the lambs slain in Egypt, and typical of the Lamb about to be offered on the cross; and having thus remembered the ancient deliverance as the law enjoined, He solemnly took some of the bread which constituted a part of the Paschal feast, and one of the cups of wine which custom had added to it, and giving them to His disciples, ordered the latter to partake of *them* in remembrance of *Him*. As the partaking of the lamb had been in remembrance of the lambs slain in Egypt, so the partaking of the bread and the wine was to be in remembrance of Him until He should come again; and as the lambs eaten at the Paschal feast had been to the partakers the lambs that were slain and eaten in Egypt on the night of the Passover, so the bread was to be to the partakers of the new feast His Body, and the wine was to be to them His Blood. The old remembrance was abolished, and a new remembrance instituted; the new remembrance to be kept up by the same means (in kind) as the old—a means, therefore, with which the disciples were quite familiar.

Holy Communion is the Christian Passover, as Baptism is the Christian Circumcision.

In what capacity is Christ to be remembered therein? It is evident, if we look to the circumstances of the institu-

tion, that it was in His essential nature and in His relation to His disciples, that Christ desired to be remembered by them. As the Master whom they had followed, as the Teacher to whom they had listened, as the Saviour by whom they were delivered, as the Divine Son of the Father, God of God, made Man, such as He really was, as they now knew Him, and as they were hereafter still more fully and perfectly to know Him, He was by this ordinance to be remembered.

More than this—it was not Christ in His life so much as Christ in His death, that was to be remembered. "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was ordained for the continual remembrance of . . . *the death* of Christ." It is therefore in His agony and bloody sweat, in the sufferings of His cross and Passion, that we are to remember Him in the Holy Communion.

But further, "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was ordained for the continual remembrance of *the sacrifice* of the death of Christ." Not only, therefore, must we fix our regards on Him as the sinless Sufferer, awakening our compassion by His meek endurance; not only as One who, in the midst of tortures, triumphed over the weakness of the flesh, thus challenging our admiration no less than by His patience our compassion; but we must recognize the agony, the bloody sweat, the cross, and the Passion as the means by which He offered up His life as a sacrifice to God. He must be remembered, therefore, as the Propitiator, the Atoner, the Redeemer, the Reconciler, and, as completing His work of propitiation, the Intercessor.

2. Commemoration differs from remembrance in that the latter is an act of the mind alone, fixing itself on some past

event, or, as Tillotson has said, "the actual thought of what we do habitually know;" while commemoration is an outward act by which we celebrate the event by some special observances. It is plain that the Holy Communion is a commemoration as well as a means of remembering. In it and by it we call to mind Christ, the Incarnate Son of God, our Redeemer, our Saviour; in it and by it we commemorate His death. This is what St. Paul teaches. He says, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show (A.V.), proclaim (R.V.), the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). These words of St. Paul derive light, like the words of institution, from the circumstances under which the ordinance was appointed. The Paschal feast was a commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt, and at each feast the president of the company "proclaimed" or "told forth" (St. Paul's word is καταγγέλλετε) the events which were to be commemorated and the propriety of the symbols by which they were commemorated. "This Passover that we eat," was the proclamation or announcement, "is in respect of the Lord passing over the houses of our fathers in Egypt; these bitter herbs that we eat are in respect of the Egyptians making the lives of our fathers bitter in Egypt; this unleavened bread that we eat is in respect of the lack of time for baking the dough that our fathers had when the Lord appeared unto them and redeemed them out of the hand of the enemy, when they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought out of Egypt. Therefore are we bound to confess, to praise, to laud, to glorify, to honour, to extol, to magnify, and to ascribe victory unto Him who did unto our fathers and to us all these signs, and who brought us forth from servitude to

freedom, from sorrow to joy, from darkness to marvellous light, and we may say before Him, 'Hallelujah'" (Mishnah). The fact of the weekly gathering of the disciples, for the purpose of eating the appointed bread and drinking the appointed wine, was in itself a continued proclamation of the death of Christ. No formal question and answer were required, as was ordained in the case of the Jews; the symbolical action was a sufficient proclamation, announcement, commemoration of the death of Christ, without words of explanation.

But the Holy Communion is not only the commemoration of Christ's death, it is still more emphatically the commemoration of His sacrifice. It commemorates the fact that Christ did not only die as heroes and martyrs have died, leaving an animating example to those that came after them, but that His death constituted a sin-offering made to God, whereby the sins of man were expiated, and the wrath of God propitiated. It proclaims that "He died for our sins" (1 Cor. xv. 3); that He "was delivered for our offences" (Rom. iv. 25); that He "gave Himself for our sins" (Gal. i. 4); that He "gave Himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. i. 6); that He "gave Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour" (Eph. v. 2); that He "was our Passover sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 7); that we "have been redeemed with the precious Blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1 Pet. i. 19); that He "is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John i. 2); and "for the sins of the whole world" (Heb. iv. 10); that we "are justified by His Blood" (1 John i. 7); that He "reconciled us to God by His cross" (Eph. ii. 16). In short, the Holy Communion is the commemoration

of the great Sacrifice of the Cross, whereby God was once for all reconciled to fallen man, and man to God. The question whether, besides being a commemoration of the great sacrifice, it is itself a commemorative sacrifice, belongs to the next division of our subject.

3. Being a Remembrance and a Commemoration, the Holy Communion is also a Memorial of Christ; for the idea of a memorial differs little from that of a commemoration, the chief distinctions between them being that the word "memorial" carries with it the thought of greater permanency and stability than "commemoration," as a commemoration might be made once or twice and then cease, whereas a memorial, when once instituted, remains in permanence.

It has been maintained that the word "memorial," as here used, signifies more than this—that there is in it a reference to "the memorial," which was a small portion of the offering presented specially to God in the Mosaic meat-offering, and in one sort of sin-offering, and in the offering of the shewbread (Lev. ii. 2, 9; v. 12; xxiv. 7). And hence it is argued that the Holy Communion is proved to be a sacrifice presented to God. It is obvious that this argument, taken alone, proves too little or too much. If it proved anything as to the sacrificial character of the material offering in Holy Communion, it would prove, not that it was a sacrifice, but that it was one particular part of a sacrifice, and *that* not the part which was to be eaten and drunk, but that part which was never to be consumed by either priest or people, and which could not have been eaten or drunk without the greatest impiety.

But is not the Holy Communion a "memorial before

God" as well as before man? Surely it is. If Cornelius' prayers and alms were a memorial before God (Acts x. 4, 31), as we know that they were, and as all earnest pleadings with Him are, much more is this the case with the Holy Communion. The Church here, more than anywhere, pleads the merits of the sacrifice of Christ, which is shown forth and exhibited in the Sacrament, and joyously commemorates before God that which Christ has wrought for man, as the grounds of man's acceptance before God. And no time and place can be better for the devout worshipper to offer his prayers and intercessions to God than when the Church is thus pleading before Him the merits of the Great Sacrifice once offered.

But this is quite a different thing from the material elements being offered in it to God as the technical "memorial" of the Levitical sacrifices.

So far, we have seen that the Holy Communion was ordained to be, and serves as, a continual Remembrance, Commemoration, and Memorial before God and man of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and of the benefits that we receive thereby.

CHAPTER III.

HITHERTO we have seen that the Holy Communion is a Remembrance, a Commemoration, a Memorial of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ. Before going on to the consideration of it in its other aspects, I cite the following authorities, to show that it is so regarded by theologians who represent the teaching of the Church of England.

Bishop Jewell: "'As for our part,' St. Augustine saith, 'Christ hath given us to celebrate in His Church an image or token of that sacrifice for the remembrance of His Passion.' Again, he saith, 'After Christ's ascension into heaven, the Flesh and Blood of this sacrifice is continued by a sacrament of remembrance.' Eusebius saith, 'We burn a sacrifice unto God, the remembrance of that great sacrifice on the cross, and Christ commanded us to offer up a remembrance of His death instead of a sacrifice.' Chrysostom saith, 'We offer indeed, but in remembrance of His death. This sacrifice is an example of that sacrifice. This that we do is done in remembrance of that that was done. We offer up the same that Christ offered; or, rather, we offer up the remembrance of that sacrifice.' Thus we offer up Christ, that is to say, an example, a commemoration, a remembrance of the death of Christ" (*Def. of Apol.* Part II., and *Reply to Mr. Harding*). This quotation from Bishop Jewell not only teaches the doctrine of a Remembrance

and Commemoration, but also shows that in teaching it the Church of England teaches the doctrine of the early Church.

Bishop Bilson: "The very Supper itself is a public memorial of that great and dreadful sacrifice—I mean of the death and blood-shedding of our Saviour" (*On Subjection and Rebellion*).

Bishop Buckeridge: "The Church, according to Christ's commandment, keeps the memory of this offering in the sacrament: 'Do this in remembrance of Me;' but she does not reiterate the action or take upon her to offer the Body of Christ" (*Discourse concerning Kneeling*).

Bishop Andrewes: "While yet this offering was not, the hope of it was kept alive by the prefiguration of it. And after it is past, the memory of it is still kept fresh in mind by the commemoration of it" (*Sermons of the Resurrection*).

Mason: "The sacrifice which the Fathers defend in the Eucharist is not propitiatory nor properly a sacrifice, but only a commemoration and representation of the sovereign sacrifice of the cross. . . . And whatsoever is a commemoration or representation of the sacrifice of the cross is different from it (for nothing is a commemoration or representation of itself)" (*Vindication of the Church of England*).

Archbishop Laud: "As Christ offered up Himself, once for all, a full and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, so did He institute and command a memory of this sacrifice in a sacrament, even till His coming again" (*Conference with Fisher*). "Nor doth any man of learning question it that I know, but that, according to our Saviour's own command, we are to do whatsoever is done in this office

as a memorial of His Body and Blood offered up and shed for us. Now, it is one thing to offer up His Body, and another to offer up the memorial of His Body with our praise and thanks for that infinite blessing" (*History of Troubles*). "If by the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ, Bellarmine means that the priest offers up that which Christ did, and not a commemoration of it only, he is erroneous in that, and can never make it good" (*Ibid.*).

Bishop Hall: "That is here (as Chrysostom speaks) a remembrance of a sacrifice; that is, as Augustine interprets it, a memorial of Christ's Passion, celebrated in the Church" (*No Peace with Rome*).

Bishop Cosin: "Who hast of Thine infinite mercy vouchsafed to ordain that dreadful sacrament for a perpetual memory of that blessed sacrifice which once Thou madest for us on the cross" (*Devotions*). "Do this in remembrance of Me. Drink this in remembrance of Me; that is, of Christ put to death and sacrificed for us upon the cross, which is the sacrifice that He truly and perfectly once made, and whereof we only make a commemoration or a representation, *toties quoties*, as often as we celebrate this His sacrament and observe the precept which He gave us about it" (*Notes: Genuine Series*).

Hammond: "The end of Christ's instituting this sacrament was on purpose that we might, at set times, frequently and constantly returning, remember and commemorate before God and man this sacrifice of the death of Christ" (*Practical Catechism*).

Bishop Patrick: "This holy rite of eating bread broken, and drinking wine poured out, is a solemn commemoration of Christ, according as He Himself saith to all His apostles,

and particularly to St. Paul, who twice makes mention of this command, 'Do this in remembrance (or for a remembrance) of Me.' His meaning is not that we should hereby call Him to mind (for we are never to forget Him), but rather that we should keep Him in mind, and endeavour to perpetuate His Name in the world, and propagate the memory of Him and His benefits to the latest posterity. Now, this is done by making a solemn rehearsal of His famous acts, and declaring the inestimable greatness of His royal love. For ἀνάμνησις doth not barely signify *recordatio* —recording or registering of His favours in our mind, but *commemoratio*—a solemn declaration that we do well to bear them in our hearts, and will continue the memory and spread the fame of Him as far and as long as ever we are able. . . . Now, of two things it is a remembrance; and two ways we commemorate or remember them: (1) It is instituted for a remembrance that He was embodied for those that believe on Him. . . . (2) It was instituted in commemoration of His Passion and sufferings for us. As the bread and wine do commemorate the truth of His Body, so do bread broken and wine poured out commemorate the truth of His sufferings for us. . . . This commemoration cannot be contained within the bounds of this world, but we must make it reach as high as heaven. (1) We do show it forth and declare it unto men. . . . (2) We do show forth the Lord's death unto God, and commemorate before Him the great things He hath done for us. We keep it (as it were) in His memory, and plead before Him the Sacrifice of His Son, which we show unto Him, humbly requiring that grace and pardon, with all other benefits of it, may be bestowed on us" (*Mensa Mystica*).

Bishop Bull: "In the ancient Church it was believed to be an ἀνάμνησις or commemoration, by the symbols of bread and wine, of the Body and Blood of Christ once offered up to God on the cross for our redemption" (*Corruptions of the Church of Rome*).

Bishop Beveridge: "By the breaking of the bread we declare Christ's Body to be broken and wounded to death; by the cup we declare His Blood to be shed or poured out for the sins of the world; and by distributing both the bread and cup to each communicant apart, we declare to every one, particularly, that Christ died for his sins, and that he may be saved by Christ's death, if he will but receive and apply it to himself, as he ought, by a quick and lively faith" (*Frequent Communion*).

Archbishop Wake: "Our blessed Saviour being now about to work out a much greater deliverance for us by offering up Himself on the cross for our redemption, He designed by this sacrament to continue the memory of this blessing. . . . We eat the bread which Christ appointed to be the remembrance of that deliverance which He has purchased for us, as the body of the lamb was commanded by God to be the remembrance of the Jews' deliverance" (*Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*).

Waterland: "Remembrance of Christ is undoubtedly a principal end of this sacrament. . . . The Greek ἀνάμνησις in this case does amount to a commemoration, and is better rendered by that word than by 'remembrance,' because the word will bear it, and because the circumstances show that remembrance alone without commemoration added is short of the idea intended by it" (*Doctrine of the Eucharist*).

Scudamore: "It is only because it was a sacrifice that the

death of Christ has procured us those benefits; and therefore it is as a sacrifice that He bids us commemorate it. Thus Eusebius (*Dem. Evang.* i. 10) calls the sacrament 'the commemoration or memorial of the great Sacrifice.' St. Augustine (*C. Faust.* xx. 21): 'Before the Advent of Christ, the Flesh and Blood of this sacrifice were promised by typical victims; in the Passion of Christ it was exhibited in the very reality; after the Ascension of Christ, it is celebrated by the Sacrament of Remembrance'" (*Notitia Eucharistica*).

From the above passages it will be seen that it is the teaching of Anglican theologians, and of the early Fathers quoted by them, that the Holy Communion is a Remembrance of Christ, a Commemoration of His Death, a Memorial of His Sacrifice, made before God and man. The exigencies of controversy having in later days forced into notice other aspects of this Sacrament, it is well, before dealing with them, to remind ourselves that, whatever else the Holy Communion may be, the principal end and object with which it was instituted by our Lord was this—to be a continual remembrance of the sacrifice of His death and of the benefits which we receive thereby. Whensoever and howsoever it best effects this, so that it be by the appointed means, it best fulfils the purpose with which it was established.

CHAPTER IV.

As long as there exists so wide a divergence of opinion as to what constitutes a sacrifice, it is hopeless that there should be an agreement on the question whether the celebration of the Holy Communion is or is not a sacrifice. Even among professed theologians there are very few that have thought this matter out. Ordinarily the word "sacrifice" does not represent any definite conception of the mind, but it brings up a vague and hazy idea of a sheep or an ox being killed, with solemn rites to propitiate the Divine Being. As long as people are possessed by any such notion as this, what wonder that they should indignantly deny a sacrificial character to the Holy Communion, unless they are prepared to adopt the Roman theory of the Mass?

The first thing, then, that we have to do is to determine what we mean by the word "sacrifice." Then we shall be able to decide whether we will or will not apply it to the celebration of the Holy Communion.

In seeking for a definition of sacrifice, we must first recognize the fact that there are many species of sacrifice, and that we must not take the characteristic of any of these species for the *differentia* of the genus. There are sacrifices Patriarchal, Pagan, Mosaic, Evangelical (or Christian); there are sacrifices material and immaterial, extrinsic and intrinsic,

bloody and unbloody, visible and invisible, literal and spiritual, Aaronical and Melchisedechian, propitiatory and gratulatory. If we admit into our definition any word expressive of a property of one of these species but not of the others, we shall not be defining sacrifice in general, but one particular kind of sacrifice. This is a favourite device with controversialists who argue for victory only, as Hooker has pointed out with his usual wisdom when he warns us not to admit into the definition of the Church any word designating the character of one part of the Church instead of the whole body. Bellarmine has practised it in the present case. He defines "sacrifice" as "an external offering made to God above, by which, in acknowledgment of human weakness and as a confession of the Divine Majesty, something visible and permanent is in mystical rite consecrated by a legitimate minister, and transmuted so as to be altogether destroyed" (*De Missa*, i. 2). Here it is plain that Bellarmine, having composed a definition applicable to one class of sacrifices, and covering the so-called sacrifice of the Mass, has adopted it as the definition of sacrifice in general, and then he has argued from his definition against the sacrificial character of all sacrifices that do not belong to the one specific class of sacrifice that has been defined by his formula.

Bellarmine's definition was framed for a controversial purpose, and must be rejected summarily. Aquinas's definition is infinitely superior, but yet it cannot be acquiesced in, because, like Bellarmine's, it defines one species of sacrifice instead of the genus. "The term 'sacrifice,'" he says, "is properly applied to anything done for the honour properly due to God with the view of propitiating Him" (*Summa*, Pars iii. 9, 48). This definition would exclude what are

called gratulatory sacrifices, such as the peace-offerings of the Jews, and it is therefore defective as a definition. St. Augustine comes nearer to what we require. He says, "A true sacrifice is any work done to unite ourselves in holy fellowship with God; that is, it must be done with reference to that supreme good by which alone we can be truly blessed" (*De Civ. Dei*, x. 6). The chief objection to this definition is its obscurity; but it will be seen at once how it rises above the definitions which circle round the death of an animal, as though that made an essential part of the idea of sacrifice.

A simpler, and in all respects a satisfactory definition, is, "A gift or offering to God made as a religious act" (see Marriott's *Grinfield Lecture on Terms of Gift and Offering*). "Gift" is the word first used in Holy Scripture for "sacrifice." "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering [Heb. *Minchah*, *i.e.* a gift, LXX. *θυσία*] unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and his offerings [LXX. *ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ*]. But unto Cain and to his offering [LXX. *θυσίαις*] He had not respect" (Gen. iv. 3-5). And when afterwards this word *Minchah* came to be appropriated to the meat-offering, another word, also meaning "gift" (*Corban*), was adopted as the generic term for "sacrifice." The Greek word *θυσία* is used by the LXX. as equivalent to *Minchah* in Cain's sacrifice and in the meat-offerings (Lev. ii. 13), and thence it came to be commonly employed by the early Christian writers, not as signifying the slaughter of a victim, but as meaning a *Minchah*, or gift to God.

The definition that we have now arrived at will take within its compass all the various species of sacrifice that have been

named above. The Patriarchal, from the sacrifices of Cain and Abel downwards; the Pagan, whether expiatory or gratulatory; the Mosaic, whether burnt-offerings, or meat-offerings, or sin-offerings, or trespass-offerings, or peace-offerings; the Evangelical, whether the sacrifice of praise (Heb. xiii. 15), or of the communication of our goods (Heb. xiii. 16), or of ourselves (Rom. xii. 1). It comprehends within its extension sacrifice material and immaterial, bloody and unbloody, visible and invisible, literal and spiritual, Aaronical and Melchisedechian, and propitiatory and gratulatory. In short, it is a definition of the genus "sacrifice," not of only one or more of its species.

We can now both understand and answer the equivocal question, Is the Holy Communion (signifying by that term the whole rite from beginning to end) a sacrifice or not? In the sense of Bellarmine and the Tridentine Church, it is not. In the sense of Aquinas and the mediæval Church, it is not. In the sense of Augustine and (as we shall see) of the earlier Fathers, it is. In the sense in which it is so called by the theologians of the English Church, and according to the definition of the term that we have adopted, it is.

We must next enter rather more fully into the distinctions which exist between the different species of sacrifice, in order to determine to which class the Holy Communion belongs.

It will be found that, however many minor differences there may be, sacrifices fall for the most part into one or the other of two great classes; they are either material or immaterial. To the material division belong the Pagan, Patriarchal, and Jewish sacrifices, consisting, as they did, of the offering of an animal or of the produce of the earth; and they have the properties of being extrinsic, visible, litera

Immaterial sacrifices, on the other hand, are intrinsic; that is, they come, *ab intus*, from within, as good thoughts, or words, or acts. This, according to St. Augustine, is a characteristic of true Christian sacrifices. "Shall we offer nothing, then?" he asks. "Are we so to come to God? And whence shall we have wherewith to appease Him?" And then he replies, "Certainly, offer: you have within you what you may offer. Do not look outside you for frankincense, but say, 'Within me, O Lord, are the offerings of praise for me to render to Thee.' Do not seek outside you for a sheep to slay. You have something within you to slay. The sacrifice to God is a troubled spirit" (*In Psal.* li.).

Immaterial sacrifices are also invisible. St. Augustine describes visible sacrifices as mere outward signs or sacraments of invisible sacrifices, the last of which are alone of any value under the Christian dispensation (*De Civit. Dei*, x. 5). "Nothing," says Waterland, "with St. Austin is true sacrifice, or acceptable service, or evangelical service (for these are so many phrases reciprocal and tantamount), but the invisible sacrifice—the sacrifice of the heart, of the mind, of the man; for the mind is the man" (*Charge*, 1740).

Immaterial sacrifices are also spiritual, while material sacrifices are comparatively earthly, and in accordance with the letter only. Origen says, "Spiritual sacrifice is that which we read of: 'Offer to God the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows to the Most Highest'" (*In Psal.* l.). "Therefore, to praise God and to offer our vows of prayer to Him, is to sacrifice to God" (*Id. in Num.*, Hom. xi.). Tertullian says, "God is to be served, not with earthly, but with spiritual sacrifices, as it is written: 'A broken and a contrite heart is the host (victim or sacrifice) which should be offered to

God;' and elsewhere: 'Offer the sacrifice of praise to God, and render thy vows to the Most Highest.' Spiritual sacrifices of praise are thus pointed to, and a broken heart is shown to be an acceptable sacrifice to God" (*Adv. Jud.* ch. v.).

That Christian sacrifices should be immaterial is argued by Justin Martyr: "We have received that God does not need material offerings from man, seeing that He Himself supplies all things; but we have been taught and are persuaded and believe that He accepts those only that imitate His excellencies, purity, and righteousness, and mercy, and the other characteristics of God" (*Apol.* i.). A little further on, he adds, "God is not in need of blood and libation and incense. . . . We praise Him to the utmost of our power with prayer and thanksgiving for all the things that He offers to us, counting that the only way to honour Him suitably is not to consume with fire the things that He has given us for our sustenance, but to offer them to ourselves and to those that are needy, and thankfully to send up to Him praises and hymns by speech" (*Ibid.*). In like manner, Lactantius says, "There are two things that must be offered—sacrifice and offering, both incorporeal. . . . 'Offering' is uprightness of soul; 'sacrifice' is praise and hymn" (*Instit.* vi. 24). St. Chrysostom speaks of Christians converted from Judaism as "having given up the service which consists of sacrifices and burnt-offerings and other corporeal things" (*Adv. Jud.* Hom. vii.). St. Cyril, of Alexandria, having contrasted the offerings of the law—oxen, sheep, doves, pigeons, fruit, fine flour, calves, incense—with the more intellectual and spiritual offerings of the Christians—meekness, faith, hope, charity, righteousness, temperance, obedience, dutifulness, praise,

and all sorts of virtues, says, "For this sacrifice being the most immaterial is the most suitable for God, who is by nature uncompounded and immaterial" (*Contra Jul.* lib. x.).

In what specific sense or senses the Holy Communion is a sacrifice, is our next question.

CHAPTER V.

In what sense or senses can the Holy Communion (understanding by this expression the whole Eucharistic rite) be legitimately called a sacrifice?

We have seen that the grand division of sacrifices is into material and immaterial. Is it material, like the Jewish sacrifices, in which there was offered an animal or some product of the earth; or is it immaterial, like the offering of prayer and praise?

The only sense in which the Holy Communion can be regarded as a material sacrifice is that in which the meat-offering was a sacrifice of the Jews. The five Mosaic sacrifices were the burnt-offering, symbolizing self-surrender; the sin-offering, ceremonially effecting propitiation; the trespass-offering, which ceremonially made satisfaction; the peace-offering, which was a pledge of reconciliation already wrought; and the meat-offering. The last-named sacrifice, or, as it was called in Hebrew, *Minchah*, consisted of flour and oil, a small portion of which was offered to God in token of His sovereignty over all things, and of loyal submission on the part of the offerer to Him, the Giver of good. As in the meat-offering, the flour and oil were presented to God as gifts of homage, so in the Holy Communion the offerings of bread and wine and of the alms, while they

serve other ends, are gifts of acknowledgment, recognizing God as the Sustainer of man's life, and as the Owner of the world and of all that it contains. Having defined "sacrifice" to be a gift or offering made to God as an act of religious worship, we must admit that the Holy Communion is in this sense a sacrifice, and that, as something material is offered, it is a material sacrifice.

It is so recognized by the earliest Christian writers. Waterland, explaining a passage of St. Clement of Rome, in which he speaks of the presentation of gifts and offerings, says, "The gifts were brought to the altar or communion table by the people, and were recommended to God's acceptance by the officiating bishop or presbyter. So there was, first, a kind of lay oblation, and next a sacerdotal oblation of the same gifts to God. Their gifts consisted partly of alms to the poor, and partly of oblations, properly so called, to the Church; and out of these last was usually taken the matter of the Eucharist, the bread and wine." Justin Martyr, in his famous description of the Lord's Supper, says, "Then bread and a cup of water and wine is offered to the officiating minister, and he, taking it, sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and gives thanks at length to Him for having vouchsafed these gifts to us" (*Apol.* i.). And he represents the bread and wine as presented "in memorial of our food, both dry and liquid," as well as a memorial of the Passion, and "that we may thank God for having created the world, with all the things therein, for the sake of man" (*Dial. cum Tryph.*).

St. Irenæus is still clearer. He says, "Showing His disciples that they were to offer firstfruits to God of His

creatures (not as though God needed them, but that they might exhibit their fruitfulness and gratitude), He took the creature bread, and gave thanks, saying, 'This is My Body;' and similarly the cup, which is a created thing like ourselves, He declared to be His Blood; and thus He taught the new oblation of the New Testament. This the Church received from the Apostles, and offers to God throughout the world—to Him, who supplies us with sustenance—the firstfruits of His own gifts in the New Testament. The oblation of the Church, which the Lord taught was to be offered in all the world, is regarded by God as a pure sacrifice, and is acceptable to Him; not that He requires a sacrifice of us, but because the offerer is glorified in that which he offers, if his gift be accepted. For it is by a gift that we show our honour and affection for a king, and the Lord wishing us to offer this gift in all simplicity and innocence, declared, saying, 'When therefore thou bringest thy gift to the altar,'" etc. (*Lib.* iv. 17, 18). And again: "The offering of the Eucharist is not carnal, but spiritual, and therefore pure. For we offer to God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving thanks to Him that He has commanded the earth to bring forth these fruits for our food; and then, having finished the offering, we call on the Holy Spirit to exhibit this sacrifice, the bread the Body of Christ, and the cup the Blood of Christ, in order that those who participate in these emblems may obtain remission of sins and eternal life" (*Fragm. Secund.*).

So, too, the lately recovered treatise called "The Teaching of the Apostles" instructs the earliest Christians to make use of the following Thanksgiving after Reception: "We give thanks to Thee, Holy Father, for Thy Holy Name, which

Thou madest to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith of immortality which Thou madest known to us through Jesus Thy Child. To Thee be the glory for ever. Thou didst create all things for Thy Name's sake, and didst give to men food and drink for enjoyment, that they may give thanks (Eucharist) to Thee ; and on us Thou bestowedst spiritual food and drink and eternal life, through Thy Child ; and above all we give thanks to Thee that Thou art mighty. To Thee be the glory for ever" (c. x.). Here it is plain that the Eucharist is regarded as a sacrifice of thanksgiving, made in joyous acknowledgment of God's goodness and power in giving food to support man's life and supplying spiritual sustenance to Christians.

In short, we may say with Bishop Harold Browne, "In all these Fathers (Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen) we find no certain reference to any offering in the Eucharist, except the offering of the bread and wine in the way of gifts or oblations to the service of God ; as the fine flour and the meat or bread-offerings were presented by the Jews, and, with these, sacrifices of prayer and thanksgiving" (*Exposition of Article XXXI.*).

The fact here stated by the learned Bishop is worthy of much more notice than it has generally received. It is without question that for 250 years of the Church's life no trace of a sacrificial idea being attached to the Holy Communion is found, except so far as it was regarded as a sacrifice of prayer and praise, and as an offering of the fruits of the earth made to God in recognition of His sovereignty, and in memorial of Christ's death. Whether any new idea was or was not added when the commemorative sacrifice came

to be dwelt on with greater emphasis, as was the case in the immediately succeeding centuries, we shall have presently to consider. At present, we cannot but ask ourselves, if it be true that in this rite the priest offers Christ Himself in sacrifice, is it possible that the Fathers for 250 years, while describing its sacrificial character, should not have used language capable of bearing such a meaning, but should have been satisfied with stating that it was a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for Christ's death, and an offering to the Creator of the fruits of the earth?

Entirely in accordance with the primitive teaching, the Church of England offers to God the alms and the oblations. And this is the only *material* oblation that she recognizes in the rite. The whole service is a *spiritual* oblation of praise and thanksgiving, and of ourselves the worshippers, and it is a commemoration of the great oblation of the Cross; but there is no material offering made except that of the unconsecrated elements and the alms.

So it was in the ancient Church Liturgies. The unconsecrated elements were offered to God in token of thankfulness for His gifts to man in the natural order, and a memorial of Christ's Passion in the spiritual order. The first idea is brought out in the Clementine Liturgy, St. Basil's Liturgy, St. Chrysostom's Liturgy, the Alexandrian Liturgy; the second in St. James's Liturgy; but both ideas are more or less present in all the Liturgies. The form of oblation in the Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom is: "Through all and in all we offer to Thee Thine own (things) out of Thine own;" and similarly the Alexandrian: "We, O Lord God, have set before Thee Thine own, out of Thy gifts;" and the Clementine: "We offer to Thee, our King and God,

according to His institution, this bread and this cup, . . . and we beseech Thee that Thou wilt look graciously on these gifts now lying before Thee, O Thou self-sufficient God, and accept them to the honour of Thy Christ." In the above oblations we have the very notion that we have attributed to the meat-offering of the Jews, and which we have found in Justin Martyr and Irenæus; that is, the loyal acknowledgment of God as the Giver of all good things, by giving back to Him a portion of His gifts. The Liturgy of St. James used the formula: "We sinners offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice," which (unless it be a later interpolation, and to be interpreted in accordance with later doctrines [1]) puts forward the thought of the memorial of the Lord's Passion. It still, however, speaks of the elements, after the oblation, as "these proposed gifts."

After consecration there was no oblation—nor is there now in the East, where the consecration is considered to be effected by the Invocation, which succeeds the oblation. But when the idea became prevalent that Christ Himself was offered to His Father by the priest, it was necessary to introduce it. Accordingly, in the Roman Mass there are two oblations, and it has become the fashion to call them the Lesser Oblation (the gift of homage and memorial offering before consecration), and the Greater Oblation (the supposed offering of Christ Himself after the bread and wine have been, as alleged, changed into Him), which, however, still testifies to its original intention by the words, "We offer to Thy

[1] There is nothing in the Liturgies which can be thereby proved to be earlier than the seventh or eighth century, which were times of great ignorance. It is only when they agree that we may feel some confidence that they represent primitive doctrine.

glorious Majesty of Thine own gifts and of the things vouchsafed to us," etc. The Church of England, to mark emphatically that she recognizes no oblation of the consecrated elements, no actual sacrifice of Christ, has transferred the prayer which makes mention of the Eucharist as a sacrifice from its usual place immediately after the consecration to the post-Communion, where it will not admit of the misunderstanding which it might otherwise have been liable to. "In removing the remaining petitions from the Consecration Prayer to the post-Communion," says Canon Trevor, "the Reformers (who must be allowed to know their own meaning) explained beyond question that no oblation of the gifts had ever been here intended. The 'bounden duty and service' of the seventh clause related to the whole celebration, and is most appropriately presented when that act is completed by communion. So, too, the reasonable sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, is most suitably offered when we have verily and indeed received the Body and Blood of Christ, and are so united with Him in the sacrifice of the cross. On the whole, the pretended mangling and displacing of the older form not only gave the true interpretation of its own meaning, but supplied a remedy for some not unimportant and liturgical mistakes" (*Sacrifice and Participation of the Holy Eucharist*).

So far as *material* sacrifice goes, then, the Church of England, following the Primitive Church, recognizes none but the offering to God of the alms and the unconsecrated elements, in acknowledgment of God's goodness to His creatures in supplying them with the necessaries of life, and in memorial of the sacrifice of Christ.

CHAPTER VI.

We have now to consider the Holy Communion as a spiritual sacrifice. We have seen that a spiritual sacrifice is as genuine a sacrifice as a material sacrifice. It falls under our definition, for it is a gift or offering to God, made as an act of religious worship; and it is recognized in the New Testament, and acknowledged by the early Fathers, as the special sacrifice of Christians, distinguishing them by its spiritual character from Jews and Pagans, whose offerings were material, and therefore inferior in kind.

The Bible teaches us that praise and thanksgiving are a sacrifice. "By him therefore let us offer the *sacrifice* of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His Name" (Heb. xiii. 15). In and by the service of the Holy Communion we offer praise and thanksgiving to God; therefore it is, in the words of the English Communion office, "our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

Again, the Bible teaches us that the bestowal of our worldly goods on the poor, or to supply the needs of the Church, if done in the love of Christ, is a sacrifice. "To do good and to communicate forget not: for with such *sacrifices* God is well pleased" (Heb. xiii. 16). "I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a *sacri-*

fice, acceptable, well-pleasing to God" (Phil. iv. 18). In the Holy Communion we make to God an offering out of our worldly goods, which offering is typical of our willingness to give up all for His sake, if He should require it of us. Therefore the Holy Communion is a sacrifice out of our substance.

Further, the Bible teaches us that the giving up of ourselves to God is a sacrifice. "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living *sacrifice*, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (Rom. xii. 1). In the Holy Communion we devote ourselves afresh to God, praying Him "that we may ever hereafter serve and please Him in newness of life," and "we offer and present unto Him ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice" unto Him. Therefore the Holy Communion is a sacrifice of ourselves. Spiritually, then, the Holy Communion is an offering of the sacrifice of our praise and thanksgiving, of charity, and of self-devotion.

We have seen that the primary reason why the earliest Christian Fathers gave the appellation of "sacrifice" to the Holy Communion was because in it bread and wine were offered to God, the Creator of all, in acknowledgment that all that sustains human life (represented by bread and wine) is His gift to man. Another reason for their so calling it was, that in their estimation it was a spiritual sacrifice, especially a sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving, in which we offer to God "the calves of our lips" (Hos. xiv. 2) as a "reasonable service" (λογικὴ λατρεία) (Rom. xii. 1). I have already shown that in the opinion of the early Fathers the spiritual sacrifice is especially the Christian sacrifice in contrast with the sacrifice of all other religious bodies. I shall

not go over this ground again, but will add a few more passages to the like effect, in which the writers are specially referring to the Holy Communion.

Athenagoras, in the middle of the second century, says, "Now, as to our not sacrificing, the Creator and Father of all does not want blood or fat, or sweet savour from flowers or incense, being Himself the perfection of sweet savour, wanting nothing, requiring nothing. But the greatest sacrifice that we can offer to Him is to know who stretched out the vault of heaven and fixed the central earth; who gathered the waters into the seas; who adorned the sky with the stars, and made the earth produce seed; who made the animals and created man. When we apprehend the creative God as sustaining and watching over the universe with that wisdom and skill with which He ever works, and raise up holy hands to Him, what hecatomb is then wanted? Why should I seek after burnt sacrifices which God needs not? And yet we should offer an unbloody sacrifice, and bring Him our reasonable service" (*Leg.* xiii.). If the last sentence is not a note added by a later hand (it has the air of one, but is counted genuine), we have in Athenagoras the first example of the use of the phrase "unbloody sacrifice," and he uses it as equivalent to "our reasonable service;" that is, Athenagoras condemns material sacrifices, and approves of a spiritual sacrifice, with allusion, as it would appear, to the Holy Communion.

Tertullian is no less decisive in his declaration of the spiritual character of the Christian sacrifice: "We do sacrifice," he says, "but in the way which God has commanded; that is, by prayer alone; for God the Creator of the universe does not need any incense or blood" (*Ad Scap.*

ii.). "I offer Him a rich and greater host, which He has commanded; that is, prayer from a chaste body, an innocent mind, and a sanctified spirit, not pennyworths of frankincense, tears of the Arabian tree," etc. (*Apol.* xxx.). "Prayer (with Psalmody) is the spiritual host which has done away with the ancient sacrifices. We (Christians) are the true worshippers, the true priests, who, praying in the Spirit, in the Spirit offer God's proper and acceptable sacrifice of prayer, which He has demanded and appointed for Himself: this we must bring to the altar of God," etc. (*De Orat.* xxvii.).

The word "host," different as its significance now is, originally meant, as used in the Liturgy, no more than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. The "sacrifice of thanksgiving" in Lev. vii. 13 is rendered by the Vulgate "host (*hostia*) of thanks;" in Lev. xxii. 29, "sacrifice of thanksgiving" is rendered as "host for thanksgiving;" in Ps. cxvi. 17, the LXX. has "sacrifice of praise," the Vulgate, "host of praise." In accordance with this usage of the word, we find in the Liturgies "victimam laudis," the "victim of praise;" and *hostiam* laudis," the "host of praise," meaning "sacrifice of praise" (*Miss. Goth.* xiii., xxxvii.).

"In the Liturgy of Jerusalem" (I quote Mr. Scudamore) "occur the words, 'Send forth Thy good grace, O God, and sanctify our souls, and bodies, and spirits, and change our minds to piety, that in a pure conscience we may offer to Thee the oil of peace, the sacrifice of praise.' The Liturgy of Cæsarea: 'Fit us for the ministry by the power of the Holy Ghost, that, standing without condemnation before Thy holy glory, we may offer unto Thee the sacrifice of praise.' In the west, the same expression occurs in the Leonian Collect and in the Gelasian Canon: 'We offer unto

Thee, O Lord, this sacrifice of praise: Remember Thy servants who offer unto Thee, this sacrifice of praise for themselves and all theirs.' In the Mozarabic and the old Gallican rites: 'Bless and sanctify this sacrifice of praise'" (*Notitia Eucharistica*, x. 4).

No one can help seeing how accordant with these expressions are the words of the Anglican Liturgy: "O Lord and heavenly Father, we Thy humble servants entirely desire Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and it only requires a little study, as we have shown, to see that by "the Host" was originally meant, not a piece of transmuted bread, but this sacrifice of praise.

The idea of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is dwelt on, as we should expect, by the chief writers and divines of the English Church. Thus, Ridley says, "The whole substance of our sacrifice, which is frequented of the Church in the Lord's Supper, consisteth in prayer, praise and giving of thanks, and in remembering and showing forth of that sacrifice upon the altar of the Cross" (*Dispute at Oxford*).

Bishop Bilson: "We never denied the Eucharist to be a sacrifice. The very name implies it to be 'the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' which is the true and lively sacrifice of the New Testament" (*Of Subjection and Rebellion*).

Bishop Buckeridge: "Although this sacrifice be not an external proper sacrifice, as our adversaries would make it, yet it hath in it spiritual sacrifices of divers sorts, all which require all humility of soul and body in the offerers" (*Discourse, etc.*).

Archbishop Laud: "At and in the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices: one by the priest only—that's the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death represented in bread broken and wine poured out; another by the priest and the people jointly, and that is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and graces we received by the precious death of Christ; the third, by every particular man for himself only, and that is the sacrifice of every man's body and soul, to serve Him in both, all the rest of his life for this blessing then bestowed on him" (*Conference with Fisher*).

Mede; "I define the Christian sacrifice *ex mente antiquæ ecclesiæ* in this manner: an oblation of thanksgiving and prayer to God the Father, through Jesus Christ and His sacrifice commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine, wherewith God had been first agnized" (*The Christian Sacrifice*). "Furthermore, that the Christian sacrifice was an oblation of prayer, and consisted in invocation, is also another way to be evinced; namely, because the Fathers, when they speak thereof, used the terms of 'prayer,' 'oblation,' and 'sacrifice,' promiscuously and interchangeably, one for the other, as words importing the same thing" (*Ibid.*).

Dean Brevint: "Sincere Christians must have their hands full, at the receiving of the Holy Communion, with four distinct sets of sacrifices. (1) The sacramental and commemorative sacrifice of Christ. (2) The real and actual sacrifice of themselves. (3) The free-will offering of their goods. (4) The peace-offering of their praises" (*Christian Sacrifice*).

Bishop Bull: "Instead of slaying of beasts and burning

of incense, whereby they praised God, and called upon His name under the Old Testament, the Fathers believed our Saviour appointed this sacrament of bread and wine as a rite whereby to give thanks and make supplication to His Father in His name" (*Corruptions of the Church of Rome*).

Waterland: "The Eucharist is a Gospel sacrifice, not the material symbols, but the service, consisting of prayer, praise, contrite hearts, self-humiliation, etc. As to any sacrifice of ours, it lies entirely in the service we perform, and in the qualifications or dispositions which we bring, which are all so much spiritual oblation or spiritual sacrifice, and nothing else" (*Doctrine of the Eucharistic*).

Before passing on, we may notice that the oblation of "ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice" (in which allusion is made to St. Paul's λογικὴ λατρεία), is recognized by the ancient, as well as by our own Church, as constituting a part of the offering made in the Holy Communion, with this characteristic difference. Whereas we of the modern world and Church offer each our own individual self, or the congregation assembled with us, the ancients offered the whole collective body of Christians under the name of the Body of Christ. This is a thought frequently brought forward by St. Augustine. "The whole redeemed city, that is, the congregation and fellowship of the saints, is offered up to God an universal sacrifice through the Great Priest. This is the sacrifice of Christians, many constituting one body in Christ" (*De Civ. Dei*, x.). "If you want to understand what the Body of Christ is, listen to the Apostle saying to the faithful, 'Ye are the Body of Christ'" (*Serm.* ccxxix.). "We ourselves, that is, the City of God, are the most noble and best sacrifice" (*De Civ. Dei*,

xix.). Carrying out this idea, Bishop Buckeridge writes, "This offering up of ourselves to Him is indeed the true and daily sacrifice of the Christian Church, which, being the mystical Body of Christ, cannot offer Christ's natural body, which Christ offered once for all upon the cross, but offereth His mystical Body, that is herself, by Christ, her High Priest and Head, unto God" (*Discourse*).

I will end this division of my subject with a passage from Eusebius, as translated and cited by Waterland: "Therefore we offer both sacrifice and incense, first celebrating the memorial of the grand sacrifice by those mysteries which He has ordained, and presenting our thanksgivings for our salvation by devout hymns and prayers. Next, we offer up ourselves to Him, and to the Logos, his High Priest, resting upon Him both with body and soul. Whereupon we endeavour to preserve to Him our bodies pure and untainted from all filthiness, and to bring Him minds free from all evil affection and stain of maliciousness; and take care to honour Him by purity of thought, sincerity of affection, and soundness of principles; for these, we are taught, are more acceptable to Him than a multitude of sacrifices streaming with blood and smoke and savour" (*Dem. Evang.* x.).

CHAPTER VII.

Is the celebration of the Holy Communion a Commemorative Sacrifice? Let us first understand what the expression means. Does it mean a sacrament commemorating the sacrifice of Christ, or a sacrifice commemorating the death of Christ? Aquinas defines the term; he writes, "This sacrament is commemorative of the Lord's Passion, which was a true sacrifice, and so it is *called* a sacrifice" (*Summ.* iii. 73, 4). And, accordingly, Waterland says, "that it is a mistake to consider that the phrase 'commemorative sacrifice' imports that the Eucharist is a sacrifice," for "it neither implies it nor contradicts it," being "a contracted or compendious form of speech, which, drawn out at full length, expresses a sacrament commemorative of a sacrifice" (*Charge*, 1740). There is no doubt that Aquinas and Waterland are right in their explanation of the meaning of the term. But even were it otherwise, the expression might still stand, for we have seen that the celebration of the Holy Communion is a spiritual and, in one sense (as offering the fruits of the earth to the Creator), a material sacrifice. Sacrificially considered, the celebration of the Holy Communion is an offering of homage, an offering of ourselves, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and a commemorative sacrifice. It is mainly in the last sense that the

Fathers, from the time of Cyprian, speak of it as a sacrifice, as it was in the first sense or senses more particularly that the earlier Fathers so spoke of it.

They are very poor controversialists who give up to the Church of Rome all the Fathers who speak of the celebration of the Holy Communion as a sacrifice or oblation. Irenæus calls it an oblation, and he means by it a presenting of bread and wine to the Creator in acknowledgment of His goodness to His creatures. How does that help the doctrine of the Mass? All the earliest Fathers speak of it as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. How does that benefit Rome? From Cyprian downwards they speak of it commonly as a commemorative sacrifice; but what do they mean by that? They tell us they mean the commemoration of the great sacrifice. Now, to allow that the Fathers who thus taught meant the Roman doctrine, and to offer them as a gift to Romanist theologians on account of the ambiguous meaning of a term that they employ: *hoc Ithacus velit et magno mercentur Atridæ.* That the Fathers of the first six centuries did not mean, by the language which they use, that, in the celebration of the Holy Communion, Christ is sacrificed, but only that a commemoration of His sacrifice was made, they tell us themselves. St. Augustine, for example, explains that we may say that Christ is sacrificed in the sacrament, but only in the sense in which we say during Holy Week, "To-morrow or next day is the day of Christ's Passion;" or on Sunday, "To-day Christ rose," although, in fact, so many years have passed since He really suffered and rose; for sacraments (*i.e.* signs of things) often take the name of the things that they signify (*Epist. ad Bonif.*). This is the use of language known as *metonymy*,

which is so common as hardly to be called a figure. When we look at a map, we say, "This is London; there is Paris." What we mean is, "This spot represents London; there is a sign representing Paris." We may say "This is London" a thousand times without being misunderstood to mean that the material city is standing on the canvas or paper. It is fortunate (for it was hardly to be expected) that such a writer as Augustine should have explained that it was in this sense that the celebration of the Holy Communion was called a sacrifice. "The Eucharist," says Bishop Harold Browne, "was a remembrance (ἀνάμνησις) of the great sacrifice on the cross," and so it was called by the name of that which it recorded (*Exp. Art.*). St. Chrysostom, like St. Augustine, has, as it were, gone out of his way to explain the same point to us. He has used very strong language, which might have been misinterpreted; but this danger has been obviated by his saying plainly that when he uses the expression "sacrifice" in connection with the Holy Eucharist, he means by it "the memorial of the sacrifice." "We offer the same sacrifice constantly," he says, "or rather, we celebrate a memorial of a sacrifice" (*Hom. in Heb.* xvii.), showing that, in his use of the words, "sacrifice" and "memorial of a sacrifice" are synonymous, but that the latter expression is exact, and the former is not. Theophylact, as usual, follows St. Chrysostom, using the words, "Or rather, we offer a memorial of that sacrifice."

Thus it came about that, to use the testimony of Waterland, "by the middle of the third century, if not sooner, the Eucharist began to be called a sacrifice on account of the grand sacrifice represented and commemorated in it; the sign, as such, now adopting the name of the thing

signified. In short, the memorial at length came to be called a sacrifice as well as an oblation, and it had a double claim to be so called, partly as it was in itself a spiritual service or sacrifice, and partly as it was a representation and commemoration of the high, tremendous sacrifice of Christ, God-man. This last view of it, being of all the most awful and endearing, came by degrees to be the most prevailing acceptation of the Christian sacrifice as held forth in the Eucharist" (*Doctrine of the Eucharist*, ch. i.).

It will be sufficient to quote a few examples of the use of the expression "commemorative sacrifice" by English divines:—

Bishop Andrewes: "Our people believe that the Eucharist was instituted by our Lord for the commemoration of Him, even of His sacrifice; or, if we may so speak, for a commemorative sacrifice, and not only for a sacrament or spiritual food." And he speaks of "the commemoration there made of the sacrifice" and "the commemorative sacrifice" as identical in meaning (*Resp. ad Bellarm.*).

Casaubon: "That the Fathers of the ancient Church recognized one sacrifice in the Christian religion which had succeeded to the place of all the sacrifices of the Mosaic law, the king (James I.) knew and acknowledged. But he contends that this sacrifice is no more than the commemoration of that which Christ once offered on the cross to His Father" (*Epist. ad Perron*).

Mede: "Though the Eucharist be a sacrifice (that is, an oblation wherein the offerer feasts with his God), yet is Christ in this sacrifice no otherwise offered than by way of commemoration only of His sacrifice once offered upon the cross" (*The Christian Sacrifice*).

Archbishop Bramhall: "Protestants acknowledge a commemoration or a representative sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist" (*Protestants' Ordination Defended*).

Bishop Bull: "The ancient Fathers held the Eucharist to be a commemorative sacrifice, and so do we" (*Corruptions of the Church of Rome*).

Bishop Stillingfleet: "If you will call the whole Eucharistical office a commemorative sacrifice, as the ancients did, I shall never quarrel with you about it" (*Idolatry of the Church of Rome*).

Bishop Beveridge: "The sacrifices under the law were typical, and this is a commemorative sacrifice" (*Church Catechism Explained*).

Waterland: "The phrase of 'commemorative sacrifice,' in such a sense as Aquinas used it in, and as signifying 'a sacrament commemorative of a sacrifice,' has been admitted by the best-learned Protestants (Cranmer, James I., Andrewes, De Dominis, Buckeridge, Morton, Field, Laud, Towerson, Payne, Patrick, Brevint) all along, without scruple" (*Charge*, 1740).

Mozley: "On the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice, the language of our divines has been very consistent and uniform; they have almost with one voice maintained a commemorative and representative sacrifice in agreement with the belief of antiquity" (*Lectures, etc.*, 1883).

It will be asked, In what sense, then, do we deny the celebration of the Holy Communion to be a sacrifice? The answer is, In the sense of the sacrifice of the Mass. At the time of the Reformation, it was a popular belief, as it is now—and the belief is supported by authorized theological statements of the Church of Rome—that the Holy Eucharist

was a practical reiteration of the Sacrifice of the Cross, in which (1) "the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead;" (2) "to have remission of pain or guilt," which the Church of England declares to be a "blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit" (Art. XXXI.). Here, then, is the essential difference between the two Churches on this point. The Church of England says that it is God's creatures, bread and wine, that are offered to God as an act of thanksgiving and in commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. The Church of Rome practically teaches that it is Christ Himself that is sacrificed, under the form of bread and wine, as an act of expiation. In condemnation of this doctrine of sacrifice, the words of the Article are not a whit too strong; and "the language of our divines" is as "consentient and uniform" in condemning *this* doctrine of sacrifice as in maintaining the doctrine of a commemorative sacrifice.

CHAPTER VIII.

It is desirable to define with greater precision the difference between the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The sacrifice in the Mass is defined by the Council of Trent to be a true, proper, propitiatory sacrifice offered to God for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities (Sess. xxii., Can. i., iii.). S. Alfonso de' Liguori, whose authority in the Church of Rome is incontrovertible, having pronounced it to be both a burnt-offering and an offering of thanksgiving, impetratory of graces and expiatory of sins, continues thus:—

"The unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass is certainly the same as the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross, not only because the same Person is offered, but also because the formal character of the sacrifice is the same, as it is offered in acknowledgment of the supreme dominion that God has of life and death. The sacrifice of the altar, therefore, as the Council of Trent says, does not essentially differ from the Sacrifice of the Cross, but only accidentally, in respect to the manner of offering, namely, that (1) in that of the Cross there was a real death, in this a mystical death: (2) that was offered by the Redeemer Himself on the altar of the Cross, this is offered by the ministry of priests: (3) that was meritorious, because the price of our redemption was

there paid, but this is not meritorious,[1] as here the merits of Christ are only applied. . . . By consecration and reception, Christ is mystically slain, and thus takes place the transmutation which is necessary for a sacrifice. . . . A true and real sacrifice requires a true and real destruction of the thing offered, which takes place only by the reception of the priest, by which the Sacramental Essence of Christ is destroyed" (*Theol. Mor.* vi. 3).

We learn, therefore, by the latest and highest authority in the Church of Rome, that in every Mass the Person of Christ is sacrificed, being offered to His Father by the ministry of a priest for the same end with which the Sacrifice of the Cross was offered by Christ.

To understand this statement aright, we must first inquire what is meant by the Person of Christ. The controversies which arose on the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies enable us to answer this question with exactness. It means the integrity of the being of that one Person, in whom the Godhead and the Manhood were in their perfection united, embracing both His Divine Nature with all its attributes and the Human Nature with all its characteristics of mind and body. What the priest sacrifices and offers to God the Father, then, is our Lord Jesus Christ, in the integrity of His Person with His full Divine Spiritual Nature, with His Human mind, understanding, and affections, and with His Human body, flesh, blood, and all things appertaining to man's nature. The Person of Christ is brought before us

[1] On the contrary, Bellarmine says, "The Sacrifice of the Mass is called propitiatory, . . . satisfactory, . . . meritorious, because it gains the grace of doing good works and acquiring merit" (Bell., *De Missâ*, xi. 4). Both being approved Doctors, each makes his opinion probable and tenable.

frequently in the Gospels during His life on earth. We see Him performing miracles, healing the sick, arguing and exhorting, walking, riding on the ass, nailed to the cross. This Person we know, by the testimony of Holy Scripture and as a dogma of the Faith, is now in heaven, at the Right Hand of God. According to the doctrine of the Mass, this same Person, in His Divine and Human integrity, without removing from heaven, (1) enters upon a new phase of existence upon the altar whenever and wherever a priest consecrates the sacred elements, that is, an infinite number of times in an infinite number of places; (2) in this multiplied phase of existence, under the appearance of Bread, but really a living Person, Divine and Human, He is offered as a propitiatory sacrifice to God the Father; (3) this existence, which had been brought about by the ministry of the priest, is again destroyed by the priest, namely, by his eating the consecrated wafer and drinking the wine, which acts cause the death or destruction of Christ in the wafer and the wine which the priest consumes. Whether He still sacramentally exists in the other wafers consecrated at the same time, until given to the communicants for consumption, or is destroyed in them also by the priest's act of eating and drinking, is not defined.

This doctrine is both stated and refuted by Dean Field in his learned work, *Of the Church*, and I prefer quoting his words to using any of my own. Accepting the scholastic definitions of Oblation and Sacrifice, he writes:—

"An Oblation they rightly define to be, the bringing of something that we have into the place where the name of God is called on, and where His honour dwelleth; a representing of it there unto God; a professing that we will own

it no longer, but that God shall be the owner of it: that it shall be holy unto Him, to be employed about His service, if it be an irrational thing; or to serve Him in some special sort, if it be rational; as when parents presented and offered their children to God to be holy unto Him: as were the Nazarites, who were to serve Him in some peculiar or special sort: and in this sort Christ presented and gave Himself to God His Father, from His first entrance into this world, and was holy unto Him, and an Oblation. But, in this sort, it is not for us to offer Christ unto God His Father, whatsoever any Papist may imagine: for it were a woeful thing for us so to give up Christ to His Father, as to profess that we will own Him no longer, nor have any interest in Him, nor claim to Him, any more. And besides, if it were fit for us so to do, yet who are we that we should present Christ unto God His Father, to be holy unto Him, that so presented and gave Himself unto Him from His first entrance into the world, that He bringeth us also to God, to be holy unto Him?

"A Sacrifice implieth more than an Oblation: for if we will sacrifice a thing unto God, we must not only present it unto Him, professing that it shall be His, and that we will own it no more, nor make any claim unto it; but we must destroy and consume it also. As we see in the old law, when living things were sacrificed, they were slain and consumed in fire: when others that had no life were sacrificed they were consumed in fire. And answerably hereunto, Christ was sacrificed on the Cross, when He was crucified and cruelly put to death by the Jews: but how He shall now be really sacrificed, sacrificing implying in it a destruction of the thing sacrificed, it is very hard to conceive. . . .

"Bellarmine saith[1] that Christ hath a twofold being; the one natural, the other sacramental. The Jews had Him present amongst them visibly, in His natural being; this being they destroyed, and so killed and sacrificed Him. The Romish priests have Him not so present, neither can they destroy His natural being, and so kill Him: but they have Him present in a sacramental presence, and in a sacramental being; this being they destroy. For consuming the accidents of bread and wine, which are then left without substance, and with which He is present, they make His presence there to cease, and so cause Him to lose that being which formerly He there had. Thus do they suppose that they newly sacrifice Christ, and destroy Him in that being wherein He is present with them. And the priest's eating is not for refection, but for consumption, that he may destroy Christ in that being wherein He is present; as the fire on the altar was wont to consume and destroy the bodies of those beasts that were put into it. But, first, it is impious to think of destroying Christ in any sort: for though it be true, that in sacrificing of Christ on the Altar of the Cross, the destroying and killing of Him was implied, and this His death was the life of the world, yet all that concurred to the killing of Him, as the Jews, the Roman soldiers, Pilate and Judas, sinned damnably: and so had done, though they had shed His blood with an intention and desire that by it the world might be redeemed. So in like sort, let the Romish priests have what intention they will, it is hellish and damnable once to think of the destroying of Christ in any sort.

[1] In Sacrificio Crucis destruebatur, ad honorem Dei, ipsum esse naturale Christi in forma humana; in Sacrificio Missæ destruitur tantum esse sacramentale (Bell., *De Missâ*, vi. 4).

And, besides, if it were lawful so to do, yet all that they do, or can do, is not sufficient to make good a real sacrificing of Christ ; because all they do, or can do, is no destroying of His being, but only of His being *somewhere*, that is, in the sacrament. For as, if the things which were brought to be sacrificed in the time of the Law, had been only removed out of some place into which they were brought, or only caused to cease to be *where* they were, and not *what* they were, they could not truly have been said to have been sacrificed ; no more can it be truly said that Christ is really sacrificed, in that the priest's consuming the accidents of bread and wine, under which they supposed Him to be, make Him cease to be *there* any longer " (*Of the Church*, Appendix, bk. iii.).

This strange doctrine of Christ being slain in the Sacrifice of the Mass by the priest's consuming the elements, apparently originated with Bellarmine. Previous to him another theory had been in vogue, which was put forward by Gregory, of Valentia. This was, that the consecration of the bread substituted for bread the Body of Christ, but not the Blood ; and the consecration of the wine substituted for wine the Blood but not the Body of Christ. But if the Body and the Blood are apart, there is not the living Christ, but Christ slain, and therefore the sacrifice might be regarded as complete, inasmuch as the Christ present was the slain Christ. This theory served for awhile, but Bellarmine saw that, even granting the soundness of the argument, it did not prove that Christ was slain *in* and *by* the sacrifice ; but unless this took place, there was, according to the accepted definition, no sacrifice, though perhaps there was a sacrificed victim. He therefore rejected the theory, and replaced it by his own. His authority has made the theory that he propounded to

be accepted, and, as we have seen, it is repeated by S. Alfonso de' Liguori, whose authority none may question, and whose words may be condemned by none.

In opposition to any such teaching, Dean Field teaches "that it is an impious thing for the priest to endeavour, as much as in him lies, to slay Christ and to pour out His Blood again," and he brings a number of instances to prove that, though "the present doctrine of the Roman Church" is "that there is a real external sacrifice in the Church which they daily offer unto God, that it worketh great effects of grace, that Christ is offered in it," yet even "at the time of Luther's appearing this was not the doctrine of the Church; for the best and principal men that then lived taught peremptorily that Christ is not newly offered any otherwise than in that He is offered *to the view* of God, nor any otherwise sacrificed than in that His sacrifice on the Cross is commemorated and represented." Nor, of course, was it only the contemporaries of Luther that thus taught, but "the consent of the Church before his time" he shows "to have been clear for us touching this point and against the Tridentine doctrine now prevailing." After more quotations, he adds that it is "evident that the best and worthiest among the guides of God's Church before Luther's time taught, as we do, that the sacrifice of the Altar is only the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and a mere representation and commemoration of the sacrifice once offered on the Cross" (*Ibid.*).

The doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass and of Transubstantiation are closely connected, and imply one the other. If it is the Person of Christ that is offered in the Oblation, the memorial gifts must have been changed into Christ; and,

again, if the memorial gifts have been changed into Christ, it must be Christ that is offered in the Oblation. Historically, as we should expect, the tenet of Transubstantiation preceded that of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Transubstantiation became the authorized teaching of the Latin Church in the thirteenth century, after the Lateran Council. The tenet of the Sacrifice of the Mass was not authorized until the sixteenth century, after the Council of Trent, though individual writers advocated it before that time. No doubt passages may be found even in the Fathers and in the Liturgies which, taken alone, are compatible with the doctrine of the Mass. But these passages had quite a different meaning before Transubstantiation had been invented, and we see what that meaning was, and must have been, when we find in the same Fathers and Liturgies other passages incompatible with the hypothesis of the Mass. We then see that in those passages the writers were employing that commonest of all figures, metonymy, whereby the thing signifying is called by the name of the thing signified, as we call a mark in a map London or Paris, and as St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine say that they use the word "sacrifice" of the Holy Communion, meaning thereby a representation or commemoration of a sacrifice.

"It is easy to see," says Bishop Harold Browne, "that when the doctrine of Transubstantiation had once been invented and defined, the doctrine of the Fathers concerning the commemoration of the sacrifice in the Eucharist would be perverted into the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass" (*Exp. of Art. XXXI.*).

The sense of the English Church on the subject will be apparent from the following passages:—

Cranmer: "The greatest blasphemy and injury that can be against Christ, and yet universally used through the Popish kingdom, is this: that the priests make their Mass a service propitiatory, to remit the sins as well of themselves as of others, both quick and dead, to whom they list to apply the same. Then, under pretence of holiness, the papistical priests have taken upon them to be Christ's successors, and to make such an oblation and sacrifice as never creature made, but Christ alone, neither He made the same any more times than once, and that was by His death upon the Cross" (*Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ*).

Ridley: "The Mass is a new, blasphemous kind of sacrifice, to satisfy and pay the price of sins, both of the dead and of the quick, to the great and intolerable contumely of Christ our Saviour, His death and Passion, which was and is the only sufficient and everlasting and available sacrifice, satisfactory for all the elect of God, from Adam the first, to the last that shall be born to the end of the world" (*Piteous Lamentation*).

Jewell: "True it is, the ministration of the Holy Communion is oftentimes by the old learned Fathers called a sacrifice, not for that they thought the priest had authority to sacrifice the Son of God, but for that therein we offer up unto God thanks and praises for the great sacrifice once made upon the Cross" (*Reply to Harding*).

Hooker: "If Christ's majestical Body have now any such new property by force whereof it may everywhere really, even in substance, present itself, or may at once be in many places, then hath the majesty of His estate extinguished the verity of His nature" (*Eccl. Pol.* bk. v. 55).

Andrewes: "That a memory is there made of the sacrifice we grant willingly; that your Christ made of bread is sacrificed there we will never grant. The word 'sacrifice' the king knoweth is used by the Fathers, nor doth he put it amongst novelties, but that of your 'Sacrifice of the Mass,' he dareth to put among them, and does so" (*Resp. ad Bellarm.*).

Mede: "The Churches of the West, of the Roman Communion, as in other things they have depraved this mystery, and swerved from the primitive pattern thereof; so have they, for many ages, disused this Oblation of bread and wine, and brought in, in lieu thereof, a real and hypostatical Oblation of Christ Himself. This blasphemous Oblation we have taken away, and justly" (*Christian Sacrifice*).

Bramhall: "The Protestants dare not say that the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice propitiatory in itself by its own proper virtue and expiatory efficacy" (*Ordination Defended*).

Cosin: "A true, real, proper, and propitiatory sacrificing of Christ *toties quoties* as this Sacrament is celebrated, which is the popish doctrine, and which cannot be done without killing of Christ so often again, we hold not; believing it to be a false and blasphemous doctrine; founding ourselves upon the Apostle's doctrine that Christ was sacrificed but once, and that He dieth no more" (*Notes* [*Genuine Series*] *on the Prayer-book*).

Bull: "The meaning of it (the Trent Creed) must necessarily be this, that in the Eucharist the very Body and Blood of Christ are again offered up to God as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the sins of men, which is an impious proposition, derogatory to the one full satisfaction of Christ, made by

His death on the Cross, and contrary to express Scripture" (*Corruptions of the Church of Rome*).

Jolly: "None but Christ could make this Oblation of Himself once offered. The representation of it in the sacrifices which were instituted to be the types and memorials of it, mere Man vested with commission from Him to that purpose might offer. But the real substance, the very flesh and blood of God incarnate, it is the most horrible presumption to think that any, the most exalted creature, could present to God with acceptance. None but He who is both God and man in one Person, the beloved Son of God, in whom He is well pleased, could offer it, being Himself both Priest and Sacrifice of infinite merit and value" (*On the Eucharist*, c. iii.).

The doctrine has no Scriptural foundation whatever. Neither has it any foundation in the faith of the Primitive Church. It is a modern inference from the mediæval tenet of Transubstantiation, rejected by the Church of England.

CHAPTER IX.

When once the theory has been adopted that it is Christ Himself that is sacrificed to His Father in the Holy Eucharist, the most reasonable hypothesis to accept, as to the manner in which that Sacrifice is effected, is that of the Church of Rome, which is known as the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass; but where men have been unwilling to accept this doctrine without modification, they have fallen back upon other hypotheses more or less akin to it. The most common of these is the theory that every time that a priest on earth makes the oblation, Christ in heaven offers Himself to His Father, the propitiatory sacrifice being thus constantly re-enacted in heaven. There is no indication of any such theory as this in Holy Scripture. There was no such belief in the Early Church, nor among the Schoolmen, nor in the Middle Ages. It is a subtlety of modern invention, unsanctioned by authority. It rests for its basis on a confusion of the Intercessory work of Christ in heaven with His Atoning work once for all performed on earth. That Christ's Presence in heaven, in the human nature in which He suffered, should be a constant pleading of the merits of His death before His Father, is one thing; that He should again and again re-enact His sacrifice there, is another. If the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had had this

modern theory before him for the purpose of refutation, he could hardly have used more emphatic language of contradiction than that which he has employed. His argument, by which the superiority of Christ's sacrifice over the Jewish sacrifices is proved, is that the latter were reiterated, while the former took place once for all. The statement is dogmatically enunciated that Christ's sacrifice took place once at a definite moment of time, and once for all; and after it had been accomplished, He is represented as entering heaven with the blood of propitiation, and there sitting down at the right hand of God. His Atoning work was finished and completed. Henceforth, as it could only be commemorated, not repeated, on earth, so it could only be exhibited, not re-enacted in heaven. "Christ is not entered into the holy places, that He should offer Himself *often* . . . but now *once for all* in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the Sacrifice of Himself. And as it is appointed unto men *once* to die . . . so Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. ix. 24-28). "Every priest (among the Jews) standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices which can never take away sin. But *He*, after He had offered *one sacrifice* for sin for ever, sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool. For by one offering He hath perfected for ever those that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 11-14). Bishop Harold Browne, arguing against the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, comments as follows on the Epistle to the Hebrews:—

"From ch. v. 1 to the end of ch. x., St. Paul is showing the superiority of Christ's priesthood to that of the Levitical priests: the superiority of the sacrifice of Christ over the

sacrifices offered under the law. Now, the very line of argument which he takes all rests upon the permanency of Christ, His priesthood, and His sacrifice. . . . The first twenty-two verses of the 10th chapter are devoted to farther insisting on this truth. The repetition of the Jewish sacrifices, St. Paul tells us, resulted from their imperfection . . . and the conclusion which is drawn is that, as Christ has obtained remission for our sins, and where remission of these is there is no more offering for sins, therefore we may draw near with a true heart with a full assurance of faith: plainly as being assured that the one sacrifice once offered has been fully sufficient for all our sins. Now, nothing can be plainer than this argument, and if it proves anything, surely it must prove that to believe in the repetition of Christ's sacrifice is to believe in its imperfection. . . . If that atoning blood be not of infinite value, we are of all creatures most miserable; but if it be of infinite value, and if the sacrifice be perfect and able to make the comers thereunto perfect, then the Apostle assures us that it cannot need, that it will not admit of repetition. . . . All combines to assure us that the one sacrifice has been once offered, that it admits no addition, that it can never be renewed. It is once for all, as man's death is but once. It is one and for ever, as God's judgment is one, and to Eternity" (*Exp. of Articles*, Art. XXXI.).

The novel doctrine not only overthrows the typical teaching of the sacrifices and other ceremonies of the Jewish dispensation (for no sacrifice could be offered within the Holy of Holies, though the blood of the sacrifice was once each year carried there), but it is also incompatible with the Catholic doctrine of the Session of Christ at the right hand

of God. The essential meaning of that dogma is that Christ has, after His Ascension, entered upon the Regal phase of His Mediatorial work, having completed the work of Atonement by His Sacrifice upon the Cross. Bishop Pearson points out that the Session at the right hand means not only Christ's possession in His own Person of the infinite power and Majesty of God, but also that "now, after all the labours and sorrows of this world, after His stripes and buffetings, after a painful and shameful death, He resteth above in unspeakable joy and everlasting felicity. . . . So Christ is ascended into heaven, where, resting from all pains and sorrows, He is seated, free from all disturbance and opposition, God having placed Him at His right hand until He hath made His enemies His footstool" (*Exp. of the Creed*, Art. VI.). But if the Propitiatory Sacrifice is constantly being re-enacted in heaven, this state of Rest and Royalty is not attained.

The tenet is also incompatible with the truth that we who are baptized into Christ's Body, and who are in Him, are in a state of acceptance with God. On this theory, as well as the ordinary theory of the Mass, the Sin-offering has again and again to be offered, not the *Peace*-offering, which is a sign of our being in communion with our God, but the *Sin*-offering, which implies that we have fallen from a state of acceptance in Christ. We are no longer reconciled children of a reconciled Father, stumbling, indeed, but yet walking in the light of His countenance. We are gone back to our heathen state; our Father's face is turned from us. We require the constant intervention of Christ, constantly offering His sacrifice for sins, lest the offended Majesty of God should refuse our prayers and keep His face averted. Why

should the sacrifice be re-enacted in heaven, if indeed its effects, when offered on earth upon the cross, were full, perfect, and sufficient as a satisfaction for sin, and of infinite and unceasing efficacy? Was it originally imperfect? Is God still unreconciled? Are we yet in our sins, and children of wrath?

It is objected that, owing to the difference of Time and Eternity, there can be no distinction between that which has been and that which is; that the sacrifice, therefore, having once been performed on the cross in time, must always be in process of performance in heaven in eternity. This is taking the matter outside our apprehension, and therefore outside the sphere of argument, because the nature of Eternity is to us incomprehensible, the idea of Time being a condition of the exertion of our faculties. It is plain, however, that this defence of the tenet cuts off all connection of time between the offering by the priest on earth and the offering by Christ in heaven, and also that, if the idea of continuance is to be entertained as to the Sacrifice, so also it is to be entertained of the Birth, Baptism, Miracles, Preaching, Death, Resurrection, Ascension of our Lord. They must all of them always be going on at the same moment. In short, to us the idea is inconceivable. "We whose standpoint is in the things of time," says Bishop Moberly, "cannot speak so. . . . To us there is before and after. To us our blessed Lord came, and died and rose and ascended at different dates in the series of things. We must not confound time and eternity, nor our doings with the Lord's doings. It may sound humble, but I believe it is really presumptuous to do so. I know not why we should not rest content to speak in the language of St.

Chrysostom, and to call the holy feast which we celebrate our Θυσία or Ἀνάμνησις τῆς Θυσίας, our sacrifice or recollection of the sacrifice" (*Bampton Lectures*, Lect. iv.).

Another objection raised is, that unless Christ has "somewhat to offer," He has resigned His Priestly for His Royal state, whereas His Priesthood is declared to be everlasting. But this is not so. "Priesthood and Sacrifice are not correlative.[1] A man who acts in behalf of others towards God, whether by making known to Him their wants or interceding for them, is thereby a priest; and again, a man who acts in behalf of God towards men by declaring to them His will and conveying to them His blessing is thereby a priest. Sacrifice being one means, and at a particular time the chief means of 'calling upon' or approaching God and receiving graces at His hands, it naturally fell to the priest to perform it as one of his functions, and by degrees it came to be regarded as his special function, and yet never in so exclusive a manner as to shut out the functions of Intercession and Benediction. The man through whose action, sacramental or otherwise, God's graces are derived to man, and man's needs are presented to God, is by that action a priest of God. To suppose that sacrifice is necessary for either one or other of the priestly functions, is to narrow the idea of priesthood in an unjustifiable manner."

It was a priestly act on the part of Aaron when he stood between the dead and the living, and the plague was stayed, and it was a priestly act when he blessed God's people in God's name, but he was not sacrificing in either case. So, too, our Lord is exercising a priestly function in heaven by

[1] I venture to quote here words that I have already made use of in the Introduction to Leviticus, "Pulpit Commentary."

His Intercession with His Father for His people (1 John ii. 2), and by the blessings which He is the means of pouring down from His Father on His people (Acts ii. 23; Eph. iv. 8), but He is not sacrificing. The one passage brought forward in proof proves the contrary, for St. John in his vision saw the Lamb not *being* slain, but "as *having been* slain," or "as though it *had been* slain" (Rev. v. 6). The Sacrifice was passed, and the time of Intercession, Benediction, and Regal office as Head of the Church was come.

It is probable that the idea of the Sacrifice taking place in heaven arose from the efforts made by liturgical commentators to explain a prayer introduced into the Roman Mass by Gregory I. at the close of the sixth century, which still retains its place there. It is as follows: "We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, to command these things to be carried by the hands of Thy Holy Angel to Thine Altar on high in sight of Thy Divine Majesty, so that all of us who by communion at this altar receive the Holy Body and Blood of Thy Son may be fulfilled with heavenly benediction and grace, through the same Christ our Lord." Whether by the Holy Angel is meant the Lord Jesus Christ, or the Holy Ghost, or an Angel, or no more than spiritual conveyance, is acrimoniously disputed down to the present day, nor is there any more agreement as to what the altar on high (sublime) means, or what, if Transubstantiation be true, "these things" can signify. One of the latest explanations is that "these things" mean the bread and wine, which "after being dedicated, are borne in mystery up to heaven, and are there consecrated by the Holy Spirit to be the Body and Blood of Christ, and offered by the Divine High Priest, whose action is thus united to that of His earthly representatives

and worshippers below, giving sanctity and efficacy to that which otherwise would be a mere typical and ineffective ceremony." This is put forward as "the ancient doctrine," although there is no ancient writer nor ancient document that in any way supports it, and as a specially devout way of apprehending the mystery of the Eucharist; whereas it is hardly possible that a really reverent mind could imagine that the unceasing occupation of the Holy Angels is to carry bread and wine, in mystery, to heaven; and the unceasing occupation of God the Holy Spirit is to consecrate this bread and wine in heaven; and the unceasing occupation of God the Son is to offer this bread and wine, thus changed into His own Body and Blood, to the Father; and the unceasing occupation of God the Father is to receive this Body and Blood as a Sacrifice offered to Him afresh: all these angelic and Divine actions finding their original impulse in the wills of the many thousand priests who at all hours in different countries are celebrating the Holy Eucharist.

The truths lying at the bottom of the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass and of the Heavenly Sacrifice must not be neglected on account of the accretions which have gathered round them. The first is, that in our Holy Communion we commemorate the death and Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, and plead it before God as the All-sufficient, All-prevailing sacrifice for the sins of all the world. The second is, that our great High Priest ever intercedes with His Father for us, and that His presence in Heaven, in our nature, as the Lamb that had been slain, serves for ever as a memorial of the one sacrifice once for all accomplished, and pleads its merits continually in our behalf.

"In the highest heavens," says Bishop Jolly, "He presents

the substance of His Body and Blood *once offered and slain upon earth*, and which must in heaven remain until the time of the restitution of all things; and His Church upon earth by the hands of those He commissioned and promised to be with them, in succession from His Apostles, to the end of the world, offers the instituted representations of them in commemorative sacrifice, to plead the merit and pray for all the benefits of His death and Passion, pardon of sins, increase of grace, and pledge of glory" (*On the Eucharist*).

Our conclusion in respect to the Eucharistic Sacrifice is as follows: The celebration of the Holy Communion may be regarded as a sacrifice (1) with all theologians, ancient and modern, as being a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and of ourselves, whether regarded as individuals or as forming the mystical Body of Christ; (2) with Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and the Fathers of the first two centuries and a half, as being an offering made to God out of His creatures in acknowledgment of His Sovereignty as the Creator and Sustainer, and in remembrance of Christ's death; (3) with Cyprian, Chrysostom, Augustine, and other Fathers of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, as a commemorative sacrifice. But it may not be regarded with the Tridentine Church as a sacrifice on the ground of its being (*a*) an offering of Christ to His Father, (*b*) for the propitiation of His wrath, and (*c*) for the expiation of sins; nor with some other theorists on the ground of its effecting a re-enactment *toties quoties* of the Sacrifice of Christ in Heaven. The Tridentine view is not only condemned by the Church of England as erroneous, but also as blasphemous and perilous to the souls of those who hold it.

CHAPTER X.

BEFORE passing on to the next point of consideration, I must pause to consider an objection which has been put forward with some persistency. It is urged that the very institution of the Holy Communion declares it to be not only a sacrifice, in the senses in which we have allowed that it may be properly so called, but a sacrifice of the very Body and Blood of Christ Himself. "This do in remembrance of Me," said our Lord, and His words are repeated in every form of consecration, ancient and modern, used by the Church. What do the words mean? Probably, had not the exigencies of controversy been very severe, no one would have ever expressed a doubt. A main purpose of the rite was unquestionably to preserve a remembrance of Christ; what more natural, then, than the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me"? Will they bear any other signification than, "Do this thing that I am now doing, and commanding you henceforth to do, in remembrance, or memorial, or commemoration of Me"? It is thought so. They are supposed by some to signify, "Sacrifice this My Body, sacrifice this My Blood, in memorial of Me." How is such an interpretation supported?

Thus—the word ποιεῖν, ordinarily translated "do" or "make," is found in some passages of the LXX. to be used for "offer" or "sacrifice." The argument is that it is so

used here. Such passages are the following: "Thou must give us also sacrifices and burnt-offerings that we may *sacrifice* unto the Lord our God" (Ex. x. 25); "The one lamb thou shalt *offer* in the morning, and the other lamb thou shalt *offer* at even" (Ex. xxix. 38); "And the priest shall *offer* the one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering" (Lev. xv. 30); "So they feared the Lord, and made unto themselves of the lowest of them priests of the high places, which *sacrificed* for them in the houses of the high places" (2 Kings xvii. 32). Other passages may be found of similar character; why should not the present passage be one of them?

The question rather is, Why should it? The reason why the word ποιεῖν is so translated in those passages is because the context requires it; nor is it unusual for a generic word, like "do" or "make," to be used in place of the more suitable specific word, when its sense is limited by the other words associated with it. This very word ποιεῖν is translated in the New Testament by "ordain," "go," "commit," "fulfil," "be," "purpose," "appoint," "continue," and many other terms. But it does not in itself mean any one of those words; the various significations are imposed upon it by the context in the various places in which they occur. It would be perfectly unreasonable to translate it "go," or "be," or "purpose," in any other sentence than those in which it is so translated, and to justify the translation by appealing to those passages. Elsewhere in the New Testament ποιεῖν is used about 550 times, and not once in the sense of "sacrifice."[1] The only possible justification

[1] The only passages in which a claim is put in for the rendering "sacrifice" are 1 Tim. ii. 1 ("I exhort that supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings be *made* for all men"), and Heb. xi. 28 ("He *kept* the Passover").

of translating it by "sacrifice" here would be that the context demanded that application of the general meaning "do." This it is impossible to affirm. We have already seen that the ordinary force of the word gives a most apposite sense, and therefore by every rule of interpretation it must be so understood.

This point has been well worked out by the late Wharton Marriott, in his *Treatise on the Holy Eucharist*, published among his "Memorials." "How do we know," he asks, "in any one of these cases, that the meaning of ποιεῖν is what is asserted? Simply because the context is such as absolutely to exclude the ordinary well-known meaning of the word, and as absolutely to require some such meaning as *to offer* or *to sacrifice*. And the fallacy of the argument we are now considering lies in this, that an interpretation of a word in an 'improper' sense, which is allowable when the context is such as absolutely to require it, is represented as equally allowable when there is nothing in the context, or in the circumstances of the case, to exclude the ordinary meaning of the word."

The weakness of the argument is made still more plain by an examination of the other passages in the LXX., where the word is supposed to be used in the sense of sacrifice. They are the following: Levit. vi. 22; ix. 7, 16, 22; xiv. 19, 30; xvii. 9; xxiii. 12; Num. ix. 2; Deut. xvi. 1; Josh. v. 10; 1 Kings viii. 64; 2 Kings x. 24, 25; xxiii. 21; 2 Chron. xxx. 1, 2; xxxv. 1, 17, 18, 19; Ezra vi. 19; Ps. lxvi. 15. These passages fall into two, and only two, groups. The first passage runs as follows: "And the priest of his sons that is anointed in his stead shall offer it" (the meat offering). Similar in character are Ex. xxix. 38, and Levit.

xv. 30, already quoted, and Levit. ix. 7: "Offer thy sin offering;" "Offer the offering of the people;" and Levit. ix. 16, "And he brought the burnt offerings and offered it;" and Levit. ix. 22, "Offering of the sin offering, and the burnt offering, and peace offerings;" and Levit. xiv. 19, "Offer the sin offering;" and Levit. xiv. 30, "Offer the one of the turtle doves;" and Levit. xvii. 9, "To offer it [a burnt offering or sacrifice] unto the Lord;" and Levit. xxiii. 12, "Offer a he lamb for a burnt offering unto the Lord;" and 1 Kings viii. 64, "He offered burnt offerings and meat offerings;" and 2 Kings x. 24, "To offer sacrifices and burnt offerings;" and 2 Kings x. 25, "Offering the burnt offering;" and Ps. lxvi. 15, "I will offer unto Thee burnt sacrifices of fatlings, with the incense of rams; I will offer bullocks with goats." The other group of passages is the following: Num. ix. 2, "Let the children of Israel also keep the Passover;" Deut. xvi. 1, "Keep the Passover unto the Lord thy God;" Josh. v. 10, "The children of Israel kept the Passover;" 2 Kings xxiii. 21, "Keep the Passover;" 2 Chron. xxx. 1, 2, "To keep the Passover unto the Lord," "To keep the Passover in the second month;" 2 Chron. xxxv. 1, "Josiah kept a Passover;" 2 Chron. xxxv. 17, 18, 19, "The children of Israel that were present kept the Passover;" Ezra vi. 19, "The children of the captivity kept the Passover."

Is it reasonable to argue that the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me" mean "Sacrifice this Body and Blood in remembrance of Me," *because* the Alexandrian translator of the Hebrew original occasionally preferred the expression "to do or make an offering" to the more precise "to offer an offering" (using the generic instead of the specific word to avoid tautology), and *because* he preferred the expression

"to do or make [that is, celebrate] the Passover" to "to sacrifice the Passover"?

Another sense in which the word ποιεῖν is used in the LXX. is to dress food. What should we think of a scholar who for that reason proposed so to translate it in the instance of us?

"In each case of an unusual rendering of the word," says Mr. Marriott, "the context puts, as it were, a badge upon it, which says clearly and unmistakably, This word is not here to be understood in its ordinary meaning. But shall we therefore conclude that we may employ the like liberty of interpretation when no such badge has been supplied by the context? And thus we are brought to the following canon of interpretation, applicable to all language as such, whether inspired or uninspired: that an ordinary word of well-known meaning is to be understood in that its ordinary meaning, unless there be something in the context, or in the circumstances of the case, by which that ordinary sense is excluded" (*Treatise on the Eucharist*).

The argument is quite a modern buttress for a pre-accepted dogma. It is not found in early times; it is not known to the Fathers, either Greek or Latin—nay, it is contradicted by the Liturgies. Thus Roman Liturgy has: "As oft as ye *do these things*, ye shall do them in remembrance of Me" (Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, vi. 2); the Milanese, "Commanding also and saying unto them, As oft as ye shall *do these things*, preach My death, announce My resurrection, hope for My advent, until I again come to you from heaven" (*Ibid.*); the very ancient Theodore: "All, therefore, take, eat of this bread and drink of this cup; and *do thus* as oft as ye shall meet together, in remembrance of Me" (*Ibid.*).

An unprimitive doctrine has to be supported by an unprimitive wresting of Holy Scripture.

The application and force of the pronoun "this" is determined by the sense of the word "do." If it meant "offer," it would refer to the Body and Blood previously spoken of; if it means "do," it relates to the word "thing," and signifies, "Do this thing that is now being done." That the latter is the true meaning cannot be reasonably doubted. The only improvement that might be made in the authorized rendering (and that is rather a matter for the commentator than for the translator) is the following: to express the force of the present tense ποιεῖτε, which is here used, and not the aorist ποιήσατε, the words "continue to do this," *might* be substituted for "do this," but even this would be a piece of hyper-exactness of scholarship. The words are rightly rendered, and they mean what they express.

There is another expression to which a sacrificial sense is attached which it will not bear. This is the expression, "Ye do shew," in 1 Cor. xi. 26: "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." To remove this mistaken idea it is only necessary to have recourse to the Greek text. We there find that the word used is καταγγέλλετε, which means simply "announce," "proclaim," "declare." The eating and drinking the bread and the cup announce to the world, age after age, the Lord's death, because it is a commemoration of it, and would have no sense or meaning had not the Lord's death taken place. But the fact that a symbolical act constitutes of itself a publication of the Lord's death does not make that act a sacrifice. "Would it not have been thought a thing incredible," says Mr. Marriott, "by one unacquainted with the

phenomena of controversy, that because our English translators (inferring, probably, from the context, as they legitimately might, that the particular mode of the 'announcing' spoken of in the text was by symbolic actions, viz. 'eating this bread' and 'drinking this cup,' as well as by words), rendered καταγγέλλετε by a term, 'shew [forth],' which would apply to either words or actions—on the strength of this, critics and theologians, with the original text and context to refer to, would deliberately quote the 'shew [forth]' of the English version as a Scriptural proof of a sacrificial showing forth to God of the death of the Lord?" (*Treatise on the Eucharist*).

Our conclusion is that neither the word ἀνάμνησις, nor the word ποιεῖν, nor the word καταγγέλλετε has a sacrificial signification, although we readily allow that the celebration of the Holy Communion may be properly called a Sacrifice, as being a symbolical acknowledgment of God's supremacy by an offering to Him out of His gifts to man, an offering of praise and thanksgiving, and a commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

CHAPTER XI.

We have now to consider the Holy Communion in another aspect—as a means of feeding upon Christ.

Singularly enough, it is that one of the Evangelists who does not recount the institution of the Holy Communion, from whom we learn most as to spiritual eating and drinking. The first passage in St. John's Gospel where this thought appears is the conversation of our Lord with the woman of Samaria. The drinking of natural water is there used as a symbol of the drinking of living water. The effects of the natural water are but passing and temporary; men drink, and then they again become thirsty, and have to drink again. Not so with the living water; its effects are permanent: "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst, but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water, springing up into everlasting life" (John iv. 14). The Samaritan woman could not fully understand His words, but He gave no plain explanation of them; He only declared that the living water, symbolized by the natural water, was "the gift of God," which, however, it was in His power to give to her on her asking Him for it. On hearing the effects of the living water, she does ask Him for it, but He makes no response, except by desiring her to summon her husband, presumably that he as well as the other Samaritans might listen to His teaching on the subject. Here the matter

is allowed to rest. What is to be gathered from it is that there is such a thing as spiritual drinking, symbolized by natural drinking, which has a powerful spiritual effect, described under the figure of a well of water in the heart springing up into eternal life.

Immediately after His conversation with the Samaritan woman, in which some as yet undeclared spiritual gift, whether it were spiritual truth once imparted to the soul, or, as afterwards appears, the presence of the Spirit of Christ in the soul, is likened in its satisfying effects to a perennial supply of water once for all drunk by the thirsty man, our Lord proceeds to declare that there is also a spiritual eating symbolized by natural eating. "In the meanwhile His disciples prayed Him, saying, Master, eat. But He said unto them, I have meat to eat that ye know not of. Therefore said the disciples one to another, Hath any man brought Him ought to eat? Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work" (John iv. 31-34). Here the sustaining power of food for the body is made to indicate and symbolize the sustaining power of obedience to God's will for the soul.

So far, we find "meat"—*i.e.* solid food—used as a symbol of the sustaining effects of a submissive and active fulfilment of the Divine will, and water as the symbol of a refreshing and satisfying spiritual gift as yet unexplained. The idea of natural eating and drinking being a sacrament of an inward and spiritual feeding will no longer be strange to Christ's hearers and disciples.

We now come to the sixth chapter of the same Evangelist, so well known in this controversy. Our Lord begins at the point already reached, namely, that there is "meat that

perisheth," and that there is "meat which endureth unto everlasting life;" in other words, that there is natural food, and that there is a spiritual food symbolized by it; and this spiritual food He says that "He will give them," just as before He had declared that He would give the living water. Next follows an illustration. The manna that had been "given" as "bread from heaven" in the wilderness was food for the body; it supported the wanderers in the desert, but nevertheless they that had eaten of it died. But there was a bread from heaven, "the true bread," symbolized by the manna, of which, if a man ate, he should not die. His auditors understood Him no more than the Samaritan woman had done. "Evermore give us this bread," they said, not knowing in the least what it was. Then our Lord proceeds a step further. He identifies Himself with the bread from heaven: "Jesus said unto them, I am the Bread of Life; he that cometh to Me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst." This is tantamount to a declaration (1) that it is Himself that is the spiritual food of the soul, and (2) that He must be received by faith. In their perplexity the Jews murmured, on which He repeats both statements in plain language: "I am that Bread of Life," "He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life," adding, however, to their perplexity, rather than removing it, by the further words, "The bread that I will give is My Flesh," and on their striving among themselves as to the possibility of eating His flesh, He adds what would have been still harder of comprehension to the Jew, to whom all blood was forbidden: "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you." Knowing the hardness of such a saying to a Jewish audience,

He reiterates it again and again in different words: "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed. He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood dwelleth in Me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me. This is that bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."

One more passage from the same Evangelist must be compared with those already cited. In connection with a well-known ceremony that took place on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles, "Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water" (John vii. 37, 38). The especial value for our purpose of this passage is that the Evangelist stops and explains what it was that was symbolized by the water: "But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." From the above passages we learn (1) that a sacramental meaning might be attached to the natural acts of eating and drinking. (2) That "meat" in the natural department symbolically signified the Bread of Life in the spiritual department. (3) That the Bread of Life was Christ Himself. (4) That it was His very Flesh and His very Blood. (5) That this Flesh and Blood had not yet been given, but were hereafter to be given "for the life of the world." (6) That water in the natural department symbolically signified Christ's Spirit.

(7) That the Spirit (like the Flesh and Blood) had not yet been given, but was to be given hereafter, namely, after Christ's ascension. (8) That the condition or means of eating Christ's Flesh and drinking His Blood, and of drinking of His Spirit, was faith. These were the antecedents of the teaching of our Lord before the institution of the Holy Communion. Are the rite and the teaching connected together; and, if so, to what degree, and in what manner?

(1) It does not appear likely that the teaching of John vi. had an immediate and direct reference to the rite of the Holy Communion. The long interval of time between the discourse and the institution of the rite is in itself sufficient, if not to prove, at least to indicate this in a manner hardly to be mistaken; and, further, the teaching in it is all of a general character. It inculcates the necessity of spiritual feeding on Christ, on His Body and His Blood, but it does not enter into any particulars as to the manner in which this is to be effected, except by declaring faith to be either a condition or the means.

(2) That the connection between the teaching and the rite is very close is, however, clear. In St. John vi. 51 we find the words, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." And in the institution we read, "Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My Body" (Matt. xxvi. 26). Can any one fail to see the similarity of expression and of idea between the two passages? Again, in St. John are the words, "Except ye . . . drink of the Blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you.

Whoso . . . drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For . . . My Blood is drink indeed. He . . . that drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him." And in St. Matthew: "And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is My Blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Is it not plain that the subject of the two passages is the same, and that there is a reference, though not in the former to the latter, yet in the latter to the former?

What is the difference between feeding on Christ as "the Bread of Life which came down from heaven," and "eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood"? The first formula emphasizes the idea that Christ in His Divine Nature is the life and support of the soul, the second that He is so by means of His Body given for us and of His Blood shed for us, that is, by the blessed effects wrought by His death. When, therefore, the time of His death was now so nigh that He regarded His Body as being already given and His Blood already being poured forth, He instituted a special means by which that eating and drinking of Him, His Body and Blood, which He had so long before declared necessary for salvation, might be performed. And this was the Holy Supper, in which those who are faithful, that is, penitent and believing communicants, symbolically eat and drink the Lord's Body and Blood, and are thus made partakers of the benefits of the atonement wrought by Him. The words long since spoken, "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you," had meant, Except ye participate in the effects of My Passion, ye have no life in you; and now at last a special method of

participating in these effects was appointed. Sacramental eating is a means of spiritual eating—not the only means, for there may be spiritual eating outside the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—but a chief means, the means specially appointed by our Lord Himself on the eve of His Passion.

On the one side, then, there are those who deny that the discourse of St. John vi. and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper have any connection with each other, and on the other side there are those who affirm that the discourse has primary and immediate reference to that Sacrament. But the true relation between them seems to be this—the discourse teaches the necessity of spiritually feeding on Christ, as the Redeemer who has given His Body to be broken and His Blood to be shed for us, and the Sacrament presents a means appointed by Christ Himself, whereby that spiritual feeding may be effected. The rite, therefore, has specifically relation to the discourse, while the discourse only generally applies to the rite, as one means by which the duty inculcated in the discourse may be fulfilled.

I will end with two passages from Waterland's treatise illustrative of what I have said above: "Our Lord's general doctrine," he writes, "in the chapter seems to abstract from all particularities, and to resolve into this: that whether with faith or without, whether in the Sacrament or out of the Sacrament, whether before Christ or since, whether in covenant or out of covenant, whether here or hereafter, no man ever was, is, or will be accepted but in and through the grand propitiation made by the Blood of Christ." And a little further on: "It is right to apply the general doctrine of John vi. to that particular case of the Eucharist, considered as worthily received; because the spiritual feeding there

mentioned is the thing signified in the Eucharist, yea, and performed likewise. After we have sufficiently proved from other Scriptures that in and by the Eucharist ordinarily such spiritual food is conveyed, it is then right to apply all that our Lord by St. John says, in the general, to that particular case; and this indeed the Fathers commonly did" (*Doctrine of the Eucharist*).

CHAPTER XII.

THE first hypothesis for us to consider as to the way in which we feed upon Christ in the Lord's Supper is that of transubstantiation. According to this hypothesis, the bread and wine in the Holy Communion cease on consecration to be bread and wine, and become the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and consequently, when the communicant places in his mouth the appearances of bread and wine he really places in it the Body and Blood of Christ, and thus he literally eats Him with his lips, and teeth, and throat, and stomach.

This doctrine—for it has become the doctrine of a portion of the Christian Church—originated in the gross and materialistic conceptions entertained by the illiterate masses admitted within the borders of the Church of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, but not properly instructed in her doctrines nor interpenetrated with her spirit. It was the way in which the rude and ignorant explained to themselves Christ's words, "I am the Bread of Life," "If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever," "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you," "This is My Body," "This is My Blood." Better instructed Christians knew that those words were to be spiritually understood, but they allowed the common people to continue in their superstitious imagination,

contemptuously believing them to be unable to rise to the higher and truer conceptions of educated men; and thus there happened what again and again has happened in the theology of the Church of Rome—the popular superstition, which had been connived at, became too strong to be resisted. The teachers had to choose between either alienating from themselves and from the Church, the people, now wedded to their favourite tenet, or accepting the superstition of the common people, making the best of it afterwards by philosophical distinctions and scholastic explanations. They chose the latter alternative, and so Transubstantiation became the accredited doctrine of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, being handed over to the Schoolmen to manipulate and to bring into a shape that would not absolutely shock and revolt the intellect of the more educated classes.

The first writer who (if all that is attributed to him be genuine) maintained a doctrine not indeed identical with, but approaching that of Transubstantiation, was Paschasius Radbert, who, being a monk of Corbey, probably expressed the sentiments of his illiterate but religious-minded brethren who belonged to the lower classes, and had not received a theological training. He lived towards the beginning of the ninth century, probably about the year 830. His views were at once controverted by Amalarius, Archdeacon of Trèves, Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, John Scotus Erigena, Walafrid Strabo, and Bertram, or Ratramnus, all of whom lived in the same century. But it was too late for men of education and position (though Archbishop Rabanus Maurus and John Scotus Erigena were the two most learned and able men of the century) to stem the tide of the

popular superstition. By the year 1000 the doctrine of Transubstantiation had made good its claim to be counted as one of the doctrines of the Western Church, though its name was not invented for another century and a half, nor was it sanctioned as a dogma till A.D. 1216.

The chief opponent of the new tenet in the eleventh century was the well-known Berengarius, Archdeacon and Chancellor of Angers, who, supported by his Bishop, Bruno, maintained that the Holy Communion was a means of spiritually feeding on Christ, but denied that the elements were changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. "The consecrated bread and wine," he says, "remain in their own substances, having a likeness of the things of which they are sacraments, for otherwise" (here he is adopting St. Augustine's argument) "they would not be sacraments at all." By the desire of Leo IX., Berengarius was brought before a synod held at Verceil in 1050, and was there condemned, together with John Scotus Erigena, who had been dead some two hundred years. As he did not succumb, he was brought before another synod, held five years later at Tours, and yet another held at Rome in 1059. At this latter synod Cardinal Humbert placed in his hands a form of recantation, which he was obliged to sign, framed as follows: "I, Berengarius, agree with the holy Roman and Apostolic See, and profess with my mouth and heart that I hold the faith on the sacrament of the Lord's Table which my Lord and Venerable Pope Nicholas and this sacred synod by evangelical and apostolic authority have delivered to me to be held, and have assured me of, namely, that the bread and wine placed upon the altar are, after consecration, not only the sacrament, symbol, or figure, but also the very

Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are sensibly (*sensualiter*), not only in sacrament, but in truth, taken and broken by the hands of the priests, and ground by the teeth of the faithful" (*Lanfranc, De Corp. et Sang. Dom.*). Berengarius was the Galileo of his day. As soon as he felt himself in safety, he repudiated his enforced recantation, and again professed his rejected doctrine. Again he was summoned before Councils, this time by Hildebrand, who had become Pope Gregory VII. At first Gregory was disposed to deal mildly with him. "He was not sure himself that what was taken at the Lord's Table was really the Body and Blood of Christ by conversion of substance." But after a delay of three months the Pope, too, found that he must adopt the popular view, and he compelled Berengarius once more to recant. "I believe in my heart, and profess with my mouth," he was made to say, "that the bread and wine placed upon the altar are, by the mystery of holy prayer and the words of our Redeemer, converted into the true, actual, and life-giving Flesh and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are, after consecration, the true Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, and which hung on the cross an offering for the salvation of the world, not only in the way of sign and in virtue of a sacrament, but also in propriety of nature and truth of substance."

Thus did the conception of the rude populace supersede the traditional and Scriptural doctrine of theologians, and take possession of the highest places in the Western Church; but, having won this position, it had necessarily to undergo certain modifications and explanations to enable men of education to profess their belief in it. With this end it was taken in hand by the "*Schola theologorum*," whose work it

was to find or to create some philosophical basis for the rude people's faith, which had now become the faith of the Western Church. This was done by a powerful section of the Schoolmen; for at this time there flourished the Realist school of philosophers, and Realism seemed to be providentially intended to supply the required basis.

Realism taught that there existed invisible, impalpable substances or essences, by partaking in which individual things became what they were, and which made them belong to particular classes. Thus it taught that there existed an essence of man, quite apart from arms, legs, body, mind, spirit, or any particular man, by partaking in which a man became man, all other things except that essence being his "accidents." So there was a tree-essence, quite apart from the trunk, branches, and leaves of a tree, and from every individual tree, which made a tree to be a tree; and there was a table-essence, which made tables to be tables, without any reference to material or shape. The theory seemed to be created for the philosophical explanation of Transubstantiation. By "substance," it was said, was meant the invisible and impalpable essence of bread and of flesh; these two essences were interchanged, or rather the essence of flesh took the place of the essence of bread on the words of consecration being uttered, while all the visible qualities of bread remained untouched. This theory at least appeared to take the matter out of physics into metaphysics, and to substitute a metaphysical possibility for a physical impossibility. Accordingly it was embraced with ardour and defended with great subtlety by the Realistic Schoolmen, and it has been ever since the recognized theory adopted by theologians of the Roman Church in the controversy.

But it has difficulties of its own. For, supposing for the moment that Realism is true, it follows that, when the substitution of the flesh-substance is made for the bread-substance, the accidents of the bread continue to exist without any subject in which to inhere—a thing contrary to the first rules of the very philosophy under which the doctrine shelters itself, and to the plain dictates of reason; for how could shape, size, hardness, exist without something to be of the shape, size, hardness? And if you take away the "thing," must not its size, shape, hardness disappear too? Of course they must. It is an axiom that, if you take away the subject, you take away its accidents. Here, then, it was necessary to bring in the agency of miracle, and to pronounce that a special miracle of God had to be wrought each time that the elements were consecrated to prevent the accidents of bread being removed with the substance, and to make them continue, suspended, as it were, in the air, without anything in which to be. God's hand was to intervene, and keep in existence an assemblage of accidents (answering in grammar to a number of adjectives without any substantive), having the extension and all other properties and effects of bread, and yet not bread, nor, strictly speaking, anything. Nor was this all, for when the flesh-substance had been substituted, another set of no less tremendous miracles was to be assumed, namely, that the new substance was (1) divested of all its own accidents and properties, and (2) invested with the accidents and properties of something else. This indeed was a hard saying, harder than any that Christ had required His disciples to believe. It was *Crede, quia impossibile.*

And, after all, this unlimited draft on faith was of no avail,

for after a very short supremacy the whole structure of the Realistic philosophy fell to the ground, and was trampled in the dust. It was proved—not by theological, but by scientific opponents—by Nominalists, Formalists (the school of Duns Scotus), and Conceptualists (the followers of Ockham), that there is no such alleged substance apart from accidents, that no real severance between a thing and its properties can be made, and that, though we can intellectually conceive the existence of some general nature or substance belonging to all things of one class, the conception that we thus arrive at subsists only in our minds, not in the things about which we are thinking. But, except upon the theory of the Realist, the notion of the substitution of the "substance" of our Lord's Body for the "substance" of bread, the "accidents" of bread being retained, has absolutely no meaning. Historically, then, the matter stands thus: The idea underlying Transubstantiation grew up by degrees in the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries as the explanation given to themselves by rude, unlettered, and unspiritual men of the way in which Christ's Flesh was to be eaten. It won its way to acceptance by the heads of the Western Church in the eleventh century. An attempt was then made to reconcile it with natural phenomena by an unsound system of human philosophy, which has been itself swept away by the progress of thought. And now the Transubstantialist stands thus: He is committed to the maintenance of a contradiction to sensible phenomena, he is committed to a false system of philosophy which vainly attempted to remove that contradiction, and he is left in possession of an unintelligible and unfounded assertion in place of a deep spiritual truth.

"Because the Church of Rome claims to be infallible,

she cannot repent of any falsehood which she has uttered. Therefore the doctrine of Transubstantiation remains bound upon the necks of all the children of God within her, together with all the contradictions, confusions, and corruptions to which it has given rise, and which cannot be got rid of by any scholastic subtleties. . . . Dreadful indeed must be the confusion, when the human mind first carnalizes deep spiritual truth, and then applies unsound metaphysics to reconcile natural facts and phenomena with its own carnal conceptions, to which it has given the title of Divine truth" (Knott, *The Supper of the Lord*).

CHAPTER XIII.

THE first statement made by the Church of England respecting the doctrine of Transubstantiation is that it "cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture." And yet it is probable that it was through a belief entertained by the vulgar that it was taught by the plain words of Scripture that the tenet arose and forced its way into the theology of the Western Church. "This is My Body," says Scripture; and the traditional teaching of the Church was made to give way to the private judgment of the unlearned as to the true interpretation of those words.

So it is with the doctrines of Purgatory and Papal Supremacy, which established themselves by means of an unlearned interpretation of special texts of Scripture (1 Cor. iii. 13; Matt. xvi. 18), in opposition to the primitive teaching as to the true meaning of those texts; and so it is with almost all, if not with all, of the dogmas of the Church of Rome.

To those who have not accustomed themselves to notice the true force of the copula "is" in all its width, and who have frequently found it to couple together things that are identical, what wonder that the expression, "This is My Body," should seem *primâ facie* to be favourable to the theory of Transubstantiation? Such an impression has to be removed or confirmed by an examination of the force of

the copula "is" in other passages. "This is red." What does it mean? That the quality of redness inheres in this thing. "This is a man." It means that this individual is contained in the class man. "This is Cæsar." If spoken by one of his contemporaries, it means, This man is identical with Cæsar. If spoken by one who is looking at a statue, it means, This represents Cæsar. "Corban is a gift." It means, Corban signifies a gift. "This man is a shining light." It means, This man in the moral sphere is equivalent to a shining light in the physical sphere. It would be endless to enumerate all the shades of meaning which the copula "is" expresses; for, in fact, it signifies no more than that there is some relation or other between the two words which it unites, without in the least defining what that relation is. It may be a relation of identity, but it may also, and may as well, be a relation of inherence, of comprehension, of presentation, of significance, of equivalence.

In the present case the proposition, "This is My Body," taken alone, may equally well express the relation of (1) physical identity, in which case it would mean, This is physically My natural Body; and (2) equivalence or spiritual identity, in which case it would mean, This is virtually My Body; or, This is in effect My Body; or, This is in power and efficacy My Body; or, This is spiritually My Body; and (3) representation, in which case it would mean, This represents My Body; or, This is a figure of My Body. And this is as far as grammar alone will take us; alone it cannot enable us to choose between the hypotheses of physical identity, spiritual identity, and representation. That must be done by other considerations, as of possibility or probability; and if such considerations make us prefer the

hypothesis of spiritual identity or of representation to that of physical identity, grammar has nothing to say to the contrary.

That the copula as used in Scripture may express physical identity is granted. That it may express, not physical identity, but either spiritual identity or representation, is evident from the following passages: Matt. v. 13, "Ye are the salt of the earth" (spiritually); Matt. v. 14, "Ye are the light of the world" (spiritually); Matt. xi. 14, "This is Elias" (spiritually); Matt. xii. 50, "The same is My brother, and sister, and mother" (spiritually); John x. 7, "I am the door of the sheep" (spiritually); John xiv. 6, "I am the way" (spiritually); John xv. 1, "I am the true vine" (spiritually); 2 Cor. iii. 2, "Ye are our epistle" (spiritually); 2 Cor. vi. 16, "Ye are the temple of the living God" (spiritually); Gal. iii. 7, "They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (spiritually); Eph. iv. 25, "We are members of one another" (spiritually); Gal. iv. 24, "These women are [represent] the two covenants;" Gal. iv. 25, "This Agar is [represents] Mount Sinai;" 1 Cor. x. 4, "That Rock was [represented] Christ;" Rev. i. 20, "The seven stars are [represent] the angels of the seven churches;" Rev. iv. 5, "Seven lamps, which are [represent] the seven Spirits of God;" Rev. v. 6, "Seven eyes, which are [represent] the seven Spirits of God;" Rev. v. 8, "Vials full of odours, which are [represent] the prayers of the saints;" Matt. xiii. 37, "He that soweth the good seed is [represents] the Son of Man. The field is [represents] the world. The good seed are [represent] the children of the kingdom, but the tares are [represent] the children of the wicked one. The enemy that sowed them

is [represents] the devil; the harvest is [represents] the end of the world; and the reapers are [represent] the angels."

The plea that the proposition, "This [bread] is My Body," necessarily means, "This is physically My Body," when put forward in good faith, is the plea of one unacquainted with the grammatical force of the copula, and with its usage in Scripture and elsewhere. The significations, "This is physically My Body," "This is spiritually My Body," "This represents My Body," are equally grammatical, equally in accordance with Scriptural language. Which of these three significations is the true one, must be decided by other considerations than those of grammar.

The consideration which should have most weight with us in this inquiry is this: What would the Apostles themselves have understood by the words at the moment when they were addressed to them? Against the hypothesis of physical identity they would have had the evidence of their senses (and let those who disparage the senses, as true informants, recollect that they open the door to an unbounded scepticism). They would have seen, have felt, have tasted, that what they received was bread and wine; and they would have been unable to fall back upon a distinction between substance and accidents; for the philosophy of Realism, on which that distinction depends, was not invented for a thousand years after that time. True, if the words of their Lord had *compelled* them to understand a physical identity, they might have refused to admit the counter-evidence of their senses; but when His words could equally well be understood to signify spiritual identity or representation, there was no reason for their doing anything so unnatural. Again, they would have seen their Master

holding something in His hands; and is it conceivable that, when His words might equally well be otherwise understood, they should have believed that they saw Him holding Himself in His hands? Is not this idea as unthinkable as that of a two-angled triangle, or of two straight lines enclosing a space? In favour of the supposition that they understood His words spiritually, we must remember that they were familiar with the thought of spiritually feeding on Him; they knew that He was the Bread of Life, and that, if they were to have life in them, they must feed on Him by faith (John vi.). And, further, we must recollect the figurative character of the feast at which the words were spoken. The whole of the Paschal Supper was symbolical. The lamb, of which they had just partaken, was regarded as representative of the lamb slain by one of the Israelitish households in Egypt, and was called "the body of the lamb." Very possibly, therefore, our Lord, as Master of the feast, had, according to Jewish custom, said to them a little before some such words as, "Take, eat; this is the body of the lamb slain in Egypt on the night of the deliverance." And after they had eaten it, knowing well that it was not the original lamb, but a lamb that represented that original lamb, He would have said, giving them the bread, "Take, eat; this is My Body," implying that, instead of eating of the lamb, they were henceforth to eat of bread, and that this bread was to represent His Body, as the lamb had represented the Egyptian lamb.

"As though He would say, Heretofore you ate the body of the lamb, a type of Me to be delivered to death for you. Now I abrogate this for ever; and instead, I give you My Body, to be crucified and broken for you; and so hereafter,

when you eat this bread, think not of the Paschal Lamb, which, like all types, is now done away in Me, but believe that you feed on My Body broken to deliver you, not from Egyptian bondage, but from the far worse bondage of death and hell" (Bishop Harold Browne, *Exposition of Art. XXVIII.*).

"The Apostles could not fail to understand Him. As that bread was broken, so was His sacred Body to be sacrificed; as that wine was poured out, so was His sacred Blood to be shed on the morrow. . . . They could not misunderstand Him. If they had doubted for one moment about His meaning, the recollection of those words He had spoken twelve months before in the Capernaum synagogue must have removed their doubt and made all clear. . . . The Apostles would be in no danger of lowering His meaning, as the Jews at Capernaum had lowered it to their own carnal level, asking, 'How can this Man give us flesh to eat?' nor would they for one moment suppose that that thing in His hand was His Flesh" (Archdeacon Norris, *Manual of the Prayer-book*).

"The whole mystery is a spiritual touchstone. But, in truth, were it not for inveterate prejudice, and teaching falsely calling itself catholic, all truly godly men would soon be led to apprehend in their true meaning our Lord's words, as well those in St. John vi. as those of the Institution, as clearly as they apprehend St. Paul's meaning when he says, 'And that Rock was Christ,' in a mystery, a figure, Christ, but really, because spiritually, powerfully, efficaciously" (Knott, *The Supper of the Lord*).

The point that we have arrived at is this—the doctrine of transubstantiation "cannot be proved by Holy Writ,"

although our Lord used the words, which are alleged as proving it, "This is My Body;" for these words do not favour the hypothesis of transubstantiation any more than the hypothesis of spiritual identification or representation. On the contrary, the circumstances under which they were uttered, taken in conjunction with other passages of Scripture, and the general spiritual tenor of Holy Writ, exclude that hypothesis. The word no more means that the bread was substantially changed into flesh than the words which our Lord used immediately afterwards, "This cup is the new testament," meant that the vessel in which the wine was contained was changed substantially into a covenant or testament. No more than the words of David, "Is not this the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives?" (2 Sam. xxiii. 17) meant that the water which he poured out had become blood. No more than our Lord's words, "Thou art a stone [*Petrus*]" (Matt. xvi. 18), meant that Peter was transubstantiated into a stone, while he preserved his accidents as a man. No more than St. John's words, "God is love" (1 John iv. 8), meant that God had lost His personality and become changed into an affection.

CHAPTER XIV.

It may be (and has been) alleged that though the sixth chapter of St. John and the words of institution do not prove transubstantiation, it can nevertheless be inferred from the tenth and eleventh chapters of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. In the first of these chapters, St. Paul asks, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?" Do these words, or do they not, declare that the wine contained in the cup becomes, when consecrated, the Blood of Christ, and that the bread, when broken, becomes the Body of Christ? They do not. They state that they are a "communion" or "participation" of the Body and Blood. This signifies that they are the means of conveying to the communicant, when properly received, a participation of the Body and Blood of Christ; but that this is done carnally to the mouth, according to the hypothesis of transubstantiation, rather than spiritually to the soul, according to the primitive doctrine, is not proved or indicated by them.

In the eleventh chapter of the same epistle, St. Paul writes, "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord"; and again, "He that eateth and

drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body" (A.V.)—"He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the Body" (R.V.). Does this passage imply that the bread and wine, which was not "discerned" as the Lord's Body, were actually and substantially the Flesh and the Blood of the Lord? Not at all; it implies that they might be regarded and might be called the Body and Blood of the Lord in some sense, but whether materially, or substantially, or spiritually, or figuratively, is in no way indicated by the expression. To be "guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord," means to be guilty of an offence respecting the Body and Blood of the Lord. Of that offence, those were guilty who "ate the bread" which symbolized the Lord's Body irreverently. To "discern" means "to distinguish" or "set apart." Of the offence of "not discerning the Lord's Body," those were guilty who consumed the sacred elements, together with the other materials of the Love-feast, not distinguishing the former, which represented the Lord's Body, from the latter, which only served to indicate and promote Christian fellowship and charity. To understand this more clearly we must recollect that in the Corinthian Church the Love-feast and the Holy Communion were at this time celebrated together. The former was a banquet provided by the brethren according to their means, the richer members giving more, the poorer less, but all partaking alike of the viands that were supplied. The practice was one which would have grown up naturally among men who, in the first fervour of their faith, felt strongly the bond of brotherhood that held them together as the followers of their one dear Lord.

But it was open to abuse, and great abuses had crept in. These St. Paul reproves, and with respect to the joint celebration of the Holy Communion with the Love-feast, he tells them that any one eating and drinking the sacred elements without distinguishing them in his heart from the constituent parts of the Love-feast, and recognizing them as the Lord's Body, ate and drank judgment to himself, which exhibited itself in visitations of varying intensity by the hand of God.

Instead of proving transubstantiation, these passages prove that transubstantiation was not taught by St. Paul or held by the first converts. What was the offence of which the Corinthian converts had become guilty? Irreverence in respect to the bread and wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received—an irreverence so great as to have led them not to distinguish between the sacred elements and common food. Had St. Paul taught them in his first preaching that the bread and wine, when consecrated, became the actual Flesh and Blood of their Lord, is it likely, is it possible, that if an abuse sprang up, it should have taken the form of irreverence? We can imagine that such a doctrine would result in the abuse of superstition or idolatry—and we know by experience that such has been the effect of it—but surely not irreverence. "That men who had been so taught should in the course of two or three years have come to regard this as an ordinary feast; that they should have come to it hungering and thirsting as for ordinary food, and gone away drunken from what they had so lately been taught was either changed into or contained the actual Flesh and the actual Blood of their crucified Lord—this is surely beyond all bounds of probability,

as it is beyond all suggestion of experience" (Marriott, *Treatise on the Holy Eucharist*).

And as the Corinthian converts could not have fallen into this special error had transubstantiation been originally taught them, so neither could St. Paul's rebuke have been what it was had he held or desired to inculcate the tenet when he wrote his epistle. The Corinthians were in the habit of celebrating the Holy Communion and the Love-feast together. Does St. Paul forbid it? No; though at a later time, when faith and love had grown yet colder, it became necessary to do so. He tells them that they commit a grievous sin if they do not distinguish between the rite of Holy Communion and the feast of brotherhood, and do not recognize the sacred character of the former, and come to it with self-examination and self-recollectedness, "discerning the Lord's Body." But he does not use any of those expressions which are natural and have become familiar since the introduction of the dogma of transubstantiation, such as we can readily imagine a transubstantialist to make use of under similar circumstances.

So with regard to the passage in the tenth chapter: "If there were a real change of the elements into Christ's natural Flesh and Blood, it seems altogether unaccountable that the force of the argument should have been weakened by the introduction of the word κοινωνία, *participation*. If the bread be literally and substantially the Body, it would have been more natural to say, 'Is not the bread which we break Christ's Body?' And the inference would be immediate: Can we eat Christ's Body and demon sacrifices together? The word κοινωνία, on which the peculiar strength of the passage depends, whilst it clearly points to

the Eucharistic elements as ordained means to enable us to partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet shows too that they are *means of partaking*, not themselves changed into the substance, of that which they represent. They are ordained that we may partake of Christ, but they are not Christ themselves" (Bishop Harold Browne, *Exposition of Art. XXVIII.*).

"The true, easy, natural, and ancient interpretation of St. Paul's words," says Waterland, "is that the Eucharist in its primary intention and in its certain effect to all worthy communicants is a communion of Christ's Body broken and Blood shed, that is to say, a present partaking of, or having a part in, our Lord's Passion and the reconcilement therein made and the blessed fruits of it" (*Doctrine of the Eucharist*).

We should notice, too, that St. Paul speaks in these passages of one of the consecrated elements, after consecration, as "bread." Why should he do so, if it was not bread, but flesh? And our Lord Himself speaks of the other element, not merely as wine, but specifically as "the fruit of the vine." At the time of institution, after He had taken the cup and given thanks and given it to them, saying, "This is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins," He added in immediate sequence, "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom" (Matt. xxvi. 29): whence it follows that the wine given to His Apostles by our Lord, and drunk by them at His command, was, in His estimation, "the fruit of the vine," that is, actually and physically, wine constituted by the juice of the grape.

Were it otherwise, that is, were transubstantiation true, the sacrament would cease to be a sacrament; for a sacrament must consist of two parts—the outward and visible sign, and the inward and invisible thing signified. But if the sign passes into the thing signified, where are the two parts? When the sign has been changed into the thing signified, the sign has ceased to exist. That which was the *res sacramenti*, the reality of which the sacrament was the sign, subsists independently of the *sacramentum* as a spiritual, or carnal, reality apart from any sign, but the *sacramentum* or sign has entirely disappeared after consecration; therefore the Holy Eucharist is to the transubstantialist no longer a sacrament. It may be a strange, weird miracle, contrary (as we hold) to physics, metaphysics, tradition, and revelation, or it may be a sacrifice, practically indistinguishable from that made on the cross, which is the aspect it wears in the Roman Mass, but it cannot be a sacrament. The sacrament is gone; the thing of which the sacrament was a sign alone remains. Any hypothesis which does not preserve the separate existence of the outward part and the inward part, whether it be an hypothesis which denies the latter, or the hypothesis of transubstantiation which removes the former, is incompatible with the fundamental idea of a sacrament. We may conclude with words of the Church of England: "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions" (Art. XXVIII.).

CHAPTER XV.

After the text of Scripture, we turn to the testimony of the early Fathers, but here we are necessarily met by a difficulty. How is it to be expected that theologians should be found condemning a doctrine which had no existence in their time? It is the same thing as requiring that divines of the present day should have in their writings a condemnation of some tenet that has not yet emerged, *e.g.* that the water in baptism is changed into the Blood of Christ. Should such a tenet be adopted as a dogma by any part of the Church—which is not impossible—there are several passages in the Fathers which might be brought forward as favourable to it; but we should have to search their works, and the works of our modern theologians, for denials of it, which could be only incidentally made, because it would not have come into their minds directly to oppose an idea which did not yet exist, or at least had not yet formulated itself. This is the case with transubstantiation. The Church held that the participation of the consecrated elements was a means of feeding on Christ, but the belief that these elements actually were Christ had not yet emerged. On the one side, therefore, the Fathers spoke freely and unguardedly, without any apprehension of their words being misunderstood in a carnal sense; and on the other, they did not trouble themselves with denying that which they did not believe any one to

hold. Occasionally, however, their arguments against the various heresies of the day required them to state their views with exactness on the nature of the Holy Communion, and these views, thus incidentally expressed, are found to be incompatible with the theory of transubstantiation. I will cite five of such passages taken from St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, Theodoret, Gelasius, and Facundus.

(1) St. Chrysostom, during his final banishment, wrote to one Cæsarius against the heresy of the Apollinarians. In his letter occur the words: "Before the consecration of the bread, we call it bread, but when by the priest's action the grace of God has sanctified it, it loses the name of bread, and is counted worthy to be called the Lord's Body, *although the nature of bread continues in it*" (p. 137, ed. Wake). Here is a formal denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation What is the transubstantialist to do? The authority of Chrysostom is too great for him to reject his doctrine as heresy, and the words are too plain to be explained away. There remains only one course—to deny the genuineness of the letter. And to this Roman controversialists have been driven—those who dare not commit themselves to a declaration of their own belief in the spuriousness of the letter, sheltering themselves under the name of some one less scrupulous. Thus, Cardinal Newman, in a book published in 1882, speaks of "the famous Epistle to Cæsarius, which is ascribed to St. Chrysostom on the authority of St. John Damascene, Anastasius, and Nicephorus; but Le Quien and Montfaucon, men of critical minds, which the ancients were not, give various reasons from internal evidence in proof that it is not the writing of St. Chrysostom" (*Note to Palmer's Visit to the Russian Church*).

It will be noted that Cardinal Newman does not here express any opinion of his own, but he casts a slur on the authority of the document as surely as though he had done so. Cardinal Bellarmine was braver, and he was answered two hundred years ago by Bishop Cosin: "Bellarmine not being able to refute this clear testimony of this great Father, satisfied himself with denying that it was a letter of Chrysostom's. But his words are idle, as well as Possevin's, when they say that it is not to be found among the works of Chrysostom. For, besides that it was at that time to be found at Florence and elsewhere, it is quoted in the *Collectanea contra Severianos* of H. Canisius, and at the end of John Damascene's book against the Acephali" (*Hist. Transubstantiationis*). The Epistle was printed by M. Bigot at Paris in 1680, and reprinted in England by Archbishop Wake in 1686.

(2) St. Augustine says, "Sacraments are signs of realities, being one thing and signifying something else" (*Contra Maximin.* ii. 22). And again: "Ye are not about to eat this Body which ye see, nor are ye about to drink that Blood which those who will crucify Me will shed. It is a sacrament" (*i.e.* a sign of something beyond itself) "which I have delivered to you: spiritually understood, it will give you life" (*In Psal.* xcviii.). "The Lord did not hesitate to say, This is My Body, when He gave the sign of His Body" (*Contra Adimantum*).

(3) Theodoret has left us among his works a remarkable discussion between an Orthodox believer and an Eutychian. The Eutychian heresy was that, after His incarnation, the nature of our Lord was but one, His human nature being merged in the Divine nature. The Eutychian argues for

his tenet from the Holy Communion, inasmuch as after consecration, he says, the bread ceases to be bread, and becomes the Body of Christ. The Orthodox answers him: "You are caught in the net that you have made yourself. For the mystic symbols do *not* depart from their own nature after consecration, but remain of the same substance and shape and form, and are visible and tangible, just as they were before" (*Dial.* ii.).

It is very interesting to see the use made of this passage by the late Mr. William Palmer during his visit to Russia in the year 1840, when arguing with a Russian archpriest who had unconsciously adopted views akin to transubstantiation: "I spoke of those passages of Theodoret, St. John Chrysostom, St. Ephrem Syrus, and Gelasius, which assert the nature or substance of bread to remain after consecration. He had never heard of those passages, and doubted if there were any such. . . . I quoted that passage in which the Eutychian argues that as the bread ceases and passes into the Body of Christ, so the human nature of Christ ceases and passes into the Divine. Before I could go on, he accepted the assertion of the Eutychian, saying that it was perfectly true, though improperly adduced to defend a heresy. When I told him the answer of the Orthodox, he was quite astonished; the whole was new to him. I went on to observe that the nature of this argument makes it impossible to ascribe to the Orthodox answer any more than to the Eutychian any meaning short of the very substance of the bread. It would be nothing to the purpose for the Orthodox to reply, 'You are caught in your own net; for though what you say is true, yet the appearances or accidents remain after consecration.' The Eutychian had

been arguing not about accidents, but about the very things themselves, and as, he said, the bread—the very bread itself —ceases and becomes the Body of Christ, so the very human nature of Christ ceases and passes into the Divine nature" (chap. xxviii.). Cardinal Newman tries to do away with the force of the argument as follows: "The passage from Theodoret to which Mr. Palmer refers is genuine, but admits of explanation. Theodoret certainly says, or implies, that after consecration the *nature* or *substance* of bread and wine remains, but he seems to use the words not in their theological sense, but for what we now call 'accidents' of a thing, that is, for its qualities, properties, belongings, surroundings, externals, for all that makes up its description, or is the medium of communication between one thing and another."

That is all that the keenest intellect in the Roman Church can allege: that Theodoret, when he said "substance," meant—no, not meant, but *seems* to have meant—"accidents." It is impossible to say what an author may or may not *seem* to mean to a man who comes to him with a theory incompatible with the hypothesis that he means what he says; but it would be quite as reasonable to suppose that when he says body, he means soul, or when he says wine, he means water, as to suppose that when he says substance, he means qualities. And the antecedent improbability that when an author used one word, he meant another, is increased indefinitely when we find that the word that he used when taken in its ordinary acceptation makes sense, and when taken otherwise makes nonsense of the argument. Cardinal Newman is not original in his method of extricating himself from the difficulty caused by Theodoret's words. He has borrowed it from Bellarmine. Bishop Cosin wrote, two

hundred years ago: "Some Romanists—but it really is too foolish—object that by the nature or substance of the symbols which is declared to continue and not to be changed, Theodoret meant the nature and (as Cardinal Bellarmine has very absurdly expressed himself) the substance of the accidents. But the whole context entirely refutes this gloss; for Theodoret joins together nature, substance, form, and figure. And how would the Eutychian argument have been overthrown by conceding that the mere accidents of bread, and not the substance itself, remained after consecration? But transubstantialists take the liberty (which we do not allow ourselves) of changing the creature into the Creator, substances into accidents, accidents into substances, anything into anything" (*Hist. Transubstantiationis*).

(4) Gelasius (probably the Pope of A.D. 480, but possibly a contemporary writer of the same name) arguing, like Theodoret, against Eutychianism, writes: "Certainly the sacraments which we receive of the Body and Blood of Christ are Divine things by which we are made partakers of the Divine nature, and yet the substance or nature of bread and wine does not cease" (*Bibl. Pat. Max.* viii. 703). Bellarmine again suggests that "by the substance of the bread is meant not the real substance, but only the nature and essence of the accidents"—which Cosin describes as *mirum effugium et miserum.*

(5) Facundus, Bishop of Hermiana, in Africa, in the middle of the sixth century, says, "The sacrament of adoption can bear the name of adoption, just as we call the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, which consists of the consecrated bread and cup, His Body and Blood; not that the bread is actually His Body and the cup His Blood, but

because they contain in themselves the mystery" (mystical representation) "of His Body and Blood. Hence it was that the Lord Himself called the bread and cup, which He blessed and delivered up to His disciples, His Body and Blood" (*De Defens. trium. Capit. Conc. Chalced.*).

The following passages may be referred to by those who desire to trace this matter further. They will be found to be in some cases irreconcilable with, in other cases directly contradictory of, the hypothesis of transubstantiation. Justin Martyr (A.D. 144), *Apol.* i. 65; Irenæus (A.D. 160), *Contra Hær.* iv. 32, iv. 2; Tertullian (A.D. 200), *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 40; Origen (A.D. 220), *Hom.* vii. *in Levit.* § 5; St. Cyprian (A.D. 250), *Epist. ad Cæcilium;* St. Athanasius (A.D. 330), *Epist.* iv. *ad Serapionem*, § 19; Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 350), *Catech. Myst.* iii. *de sacro Chrismate*, § 3; St. Basil (A.D. 360), *Anaphora;* St. Gregory Nyssen (A.D. 370), *Oratio in baptismum Christi;* St. Jerome (A.D. 390), *In Ephes.* i. 7; St. Ephrem (A.D. 540), *De sacris Antiochiæ legibus apud Photii Myriobiblon*, ccxxix.; Isidore of Seville (A.D. 630), *De Off. Eccl.* i. 18; Bede (A.D. 720), *Comm. in Luc.* xxii.; Charlemagne (A.D. 779), *Epist. ad Alcuinum;* Amalarius (A.D. 820), *De Eccles. Offic.* i. 24; Rabanus Maurus (A.D. 825), *De Instit. Cler.* i. 31; Walafrid Strabo (A.D. 860), *De Exordiis Rerum Ecclesiast.* ch. xvi.; Bertram (A.D. 860), *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini;* Ælfric (A.D. 990), *Epist. ad Wulfstanum;* Berengarius (A.D. 1050), in Lanfranc's *De veritate Corporis Domini in Eucharistia;* St. Bernard (A.D. 1120), *Sermones de Purificatione et de Sto. Martino.* These passages, and others of like tenor, may be seen quoted in Bishop Cosin's *History of Transubstantiation*, and in Bishop Harold Browne's *Exposition of Art. XXVII.* Cosin appends to

his citations and references the following remarks: "Hence it is plain that the gangrene of transubstantiation had not yet (at the end of the tenth century) eaten into the Churches of the Christian world, but that sound doctrine was everywhere retained about the Body and Blood of the Lord, and His true (but spiritual and mystical, not carnal) presence, together with the symbols of bread and wine, which were regarded as remaining in their own substance after consecration. Though the ancient Fathers used both ways of speaking, namely, that the bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ, into which they are mystically changed, and also that they are the signs, symbols, types, pledges, images, figures, likenesses, representations, copies of the true Body and Blood of Christ, retaining their own proper substance; yet there was no contradiction or difference in their meaning. For no one was so wanting in faith as to believe these to be only empty or bare signs or elements, nor so gross and rude as not to distinguish the sacramental and mystical from that carnal and natural presence of Christ which is now taught by the transubstantialists. For they understood that exactly such a change as is common to all sacraments takes place here, namely, that the outward symbols are *said to be* turned into the Divine realities for this reason only, because they truly and efficaciously represent them, and the faithful are made truly to partake in the latter, while they receive the former in their mouths, and by the power of the Holy Spirit and the institution of Christ, the symbols acquire a Divine privilege, which of their own nature they have not. And this it is that learned and sacred antiquity delivered out of the canonical Scriptures about the holy mystery of the Eucharist for a thousand years and more" (*Hist. Transubstantiationis*).

CHAPTER XVI.

PASSAGES directly for or against the tenet of transubstantiation may be much more readily quoted from modern than from ancient divines; for when once that doctrine had been formulated at the Council of the Lateran, A.D. 1216, theologians who touched on the subject at all could no longer fail to declare their acceptance or their rejection of it. From the time of that Council, transubstantiation has been the acknowledged doctrine of the Church of Rome. The definition of it was not indeed framed by the Council, but it was propounded to the Council by Innocent III., and having been heard in silence was considered to have received the Council's sanction. The definition ran as follows: "The Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament of the altar are truly contained under the appearances (species) of bread and wine, the bread having been transubstantiated into the Body and the wine into the Blood." All who denied the statement were to be handed over to the secular authorities for due punishment; inquisition was to be made as to those suspected of not holding it, and the secular powers were to be compelled by ecclesiastical censure to banish disbelievers in it, and, on their neglecting to do so, to be themselves excommunicated, their subjects absolved from obedience to them, and their territories occupied by faithful sons of the Roman Church. From henceforth the argument from Scrip-

ture and the Realistic Philosophy was allowed to fall into the background, and the authority of the Roman Church was substituted in its place. "The chief thing," said Duns Scotus, with the later Schoolmen, "is to hold about the sacrament what the Holy Roman Church holds" (*Comm. in lib.* iv. *Sent. disp.* xi.). "I prove," says another, "that the bread is changed into the Body of Christ, because we must hold what the Roman Pontiff says must be held" (*Joan Bacon, in lib.* iii. *et* iv. *Sent.*). The Council of Constance, A.D. 1415, which condemned Wycliff and burnt Huss, and sanctioned half communion, renewed the declaration of transubstantiation, and so did the "Instruction to the Armenians," composed by Pope Eugenius IV., some months after the Council of Florence, A.D. 1439, and often quoted as part of the acts of that Council. At the Council of Trent, A.D. 1551, it was decreed that "by consecration there is effected a change of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood" (*Sess.* xiii. *De Eucharistia*); and the Creed of Pope Pius IV. summed up the whole matter in the following words: "In the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the soul and Divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and there takes place a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation."

The first man who set his face as a rock against the mediæval doctrine, consciously regarding it as a corruption or, as he terms it, a heresy, was Wycliff, A.D. 1324. "Do we believe," he writes, "that John the Baptist, who was made

Elias by the word of Christ, ceased to be John? . . . In the same manner this sacrament is not naturally the Body of Christ, but this same sacrament is Christ's Body figuratively. . . . Let the believer rouse himself and demand strictly from our heretics (Romanists) what the nature of this venerable sacrament is, if it be not bread; since the language of the Gospel, the evidence of our senses, and arguments that have in their favour every probability, say that so it is. . . . That this venerable sacrament is in its own nature veritable bread and sacramentally Christ's Body, is shown to be the true conclusion. Hardness, softness, etc., cannot exist *per se*, nor can they be the subjects of other accidents; it remains, therefore, that there must be some subject as bread. . . . Oh, how great diversity is between us that trow that this sacrament is very bread in its kind, and between heretics that tell us that it is an accident without subject! For before that the fiend, father of lies, was loosed, was never this gabbing contrived" (*Trialogus*, bk. iv.).

Tyndall, A.D. 1477: "Neither let it offend them that *est* is taken for *significat*. For this is a common manner of speech in many places of Scripture, and also in our mother tongue, as when we see many pictures or images, which we know well are but signs to represent the bodies whom they be made like, yet we say of the image of our Lady, This is our Lady; and of St. Katherine, This is St. Katherine; and yet do they but represent our Lady or St. Katherine. The three baskets are three days, etc., etc. Marvel not, therefore, though *est*, likewise in this sentence, '*Hoc est corpus meum*,' be taken for *significat*, as much as to say, 'This signifieth my body'" (*Works*, *Parker Society*).

Latimer, A.D. 1480: "As for that which is feigned of

many concerning the corporal presence, I, for my part, take it for a papistical invention, and therefore I think it is utterly to be rejected" (Demaus' *Life of Hugh Latimer*).

Cranmer, A.D. 1489: "The rest is but branches and leaves, or the cutting down of weeds, but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the popish doctrine of transubstantiation" (*Doctrine of the Sacrament*).

Ridley, A.D. 1500: "The words of the Lord's Supper, the circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy of the sacraments, and the sayings of the Fathers, do most effectually and plainly prove a figurative speech in the words of the Lord's Supper. The Fathers do quite overthrow transubstantiation, but of all others most evidently and plainly, Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom (to Cæsarius), Augustine (against Adimantus), Gelasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Rabanus, Damascene, and Bertram" (*Discussions at Oxford*).

Becon, A.D. 1511: "He that goeth about to pluck from the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ the bread and wine, destroyeth utterly the aforesaid sacrament and maketh it no sacrament" (*On the Sacraments*).

Andrewes, A.D. 1555: "This device, of the substance of the bread and wine to be flown away and gone, and in the room of it a remainder of nothing else but accidents to stay behind, was to them (the Fathers) not known, and had it been true, had made for Eutyches and against them" (*Serm.* xvi., *On the Nativity*).

Laud, A.D. 1573: "Transubstantiation is either a fundamental point, or it is not. If it is not fundamental, why did the Papist put the Protestant to death for it? And why did the Protestant suffer death?" (*History of Troubles and Trial*).

Hall, A.D. 1574: "How mad, yea, how impious, is this, that they will overturn the very principles of nature, the order of things, the humanity of the Saviour, the truth of the sacrament, the constant judgment of Scripture, and, lastly, the very foundations of the Divinity, and confusedly jumble heaven and earth together, rather than they will, when necessity requires it, admit but of a tropical kind of speech" (*No Peace with Rome*).

Usher, A.D. 1580: "In the receiving of the blessed sacrament, we are to distinguish between the outward and the inward action of the communicant. In the outward, with our bodily mouth we receive really the visible elements of bread and wine; in the inward, we do by faith really receive the Body and Blood of our Lord" (*Answer to Challenge by Jesuit*).

Mede, A.D. 1586: "If the Fathers ate the same spiritual meat which we do, then we eat not the real Body nor drink the real Blood of Christ. For the manna they ate was the same manna still, though a sacrament of Christ. The water of the rock was verily water still, though a sacrament of His Blood. If, then, we eat the same spiritual bread, we eat bread still, though spiritual bread. If we drink the same spiritual drink, our drink is wine still, though it is a spiritual wine" (*Discourses*).

Jeremy Taylor, A.D. 1613: "When it is equally affirmed to be bread as to be our Lord's Body, and but one of them can be naturally true and in the letter, then shall the testimony of our senses be of no use in casting the balance? The two affirmatives are equal. One must be expounded tropically. Which will you choose? Is there anything more certain and expedite than that what you see, and feel, and taste,

natural and proper, should be judged to be that you feel and taste naturally and properly, and that, therefore, the other should be expounded tropically?" (*On the Real Presence*).

Pearson, A.D. 1613: "Consult the holy Fathers, who call it Bread a thousand times, and speak of it as both the Body and Bread, and never, I think, absolutely deny it to be bread. Here, then, let us walk in this rule which the Church has handed down to us from the Apostles, and the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God" (*Concio I. ad Clerum*).

Beveridge, A.D. 1636: "Scripture and the Fathers holding forth so clearly that whosoever worthily receiveth the sacrament of the Lord's Supper doth certainly partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, the devil thence took occasion to draw men into an opinion that the bread which is used in that sacrament is the very Body that was crucified on the cross, and the wine, after consecration, the very Blood that gushed out of His pierced side" (*On the Thirty-nine Articles*).

Wake, A.D. 1657: "To state the notion of the Real Presence as held by the Church of England, I must observe, first, that our Church utterly denies our Saviour's Body to be so really present in the blessed sacrament as either to leave heaven or to exist in two several places at the same time. Again, secondly, we deny that in the sacred elements which we receive there is any other substance than that of bread and wine distributed to the communicants, which alone they take into their mouth and press with their teeth. In short, all which the doctrine of our Church implies by this phrase is only a real presence of Christ's invisible power and grace so in and with the elements as by the faithful

receiving of them to convey spiritual and real effect to the souls of men" (*Discourse*).

Waterland, A.D. 1683: "To say that the communion of our Lord's Body and Blood means the receiving His natural Flesh and Blood into our mouths, under the forms, accidents, or appearances of bread and wine, is manifestly a forced and late interpretation, not heard of for eight hundred years or more, and, besides, absurd, contradictory, and impossible. If we may trust to our reason or to our senses (and, if we may not, what is there that we can trust to?), the bread and wine do remain after consecration the same in substance as before, changed only as to their uses, relations, or offices" (*Doctrine of the Eucharist*).

Mozley, A.D. 1813: "The whole was simply a subtle and barren philosophical speculation, ending in mere words, without sense or meaning, and entirely foreign to a spiritual ordinance and to a channel of Divine grace. Our Church, therefore, at the Reformation, rejected transubstantiation, and fell back upon the earlier and more indefinite idea of a change in the elements, as a change, namely, which was true and real for all the purposes of the sacrament, by which the elements became, from being mere physical food, spiritual food" (*Lectures*).

Goulburn, A.D. 1818: "The whole history of the Lord's Supper, culminating as it does in the heresy of transubstantiation, shows a sad tendency in the human mind to localize and materialize the blessings of this ordinance. I mean by localizing and materializing the blessing, the placing of it entirely in the outward and visible sign, the imagining some mysterious charm, a virtue half physical, half spiritual, to reside in the crumbs of bread and in the drops of wine. . . . If

there is in the human mind a tendency, which has made itself only too manifest in the history of the Church, to crave after the bodily visible presence of our Lord, who can doubt that this tendency is at the bottom of the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation?" (*On the Communion Office*).

These strong and unequivocal condemnations of the doctrine of transubstantiation by English divines (and others might readily be added to them) are so much the more valuable, as they are not the utterances of men who in a panic have fled from one extreme into another, but are accompanied by declarations equally strong, maintaining the doctrine of a spiritual presence, and affirming that the outward signs are means appointed by God whereby those who duly receive them are made partakers of Christ and of the benefits of His atoning death.

CHAPTER XVII.

The Church of England objects, in Article XXVIII., to the doctrine of transubstantiation, not only that it is contrary to Scripture and overthrows the nature of a sacrament, but also that it has given occasion to many superstitions. Four of these superstitions it goes on to name. They are, the reservation of the sacrament, its being carried about, lifted up, and worshipped.

It is said, How can you consistently object to Reservation, when it cannot be denied that it was a practice of the earliest ages of the Church? This argument is well worthy of careful attention—the more as it is an instance of the method not unfrequently resorted to by the controversialists of the Church of Rome, when required to justify her doctrines. This method is that of taking a word which was used in primitive times in one sense, employing it in another sense, and arguing that the thing meant by the latter signification of the word is primitive, because the word itself is primitive, although it then meant something quite different. For example, the original meaning of the word "indulgence" was very innocent; it meant excusing or forgiving a certain portion of a penance imposed upon a sinner on assurance of his having become fully penitent. But, after a time, "indulgence" came instead to mean, first, forgiveness of sins,

then, when that was no longer tenable, the forgiveness of the temporal punishment for sin already forgiven, involving the application of the supererogatory merits of the saints to the souls in purgatory, and much more to the like effect. It is plain that the use of the word "indulgence," in its first sense, is no justification for the doctrine of indulgences in the latter sense.

So here. There was a Reservation in the Early Ages, but it differed in kind from the Reservation afterwards and still practised, and consequently the earlier "Reservation" cannot be appealed to as justifying the latter "Reservation."

The Reservation of the Early Church was made for the purpose of giving communion to the sick or those who, from persecution or other causes, were unable to present themselves at the table of the Lord with their brethren. A part of the consecrated elements was carried by the deacons to those who were not present, we are told by Justin Martyr, A.D. 140 (*Apol.* i. 65). Dionysius, of Alexandria, A.D. 254, spoke of a small portion of the Eucharist being sent to a sick man named Serapion (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 44); there are indications of the consecrated elements being allowed to be taken away by the communicants for after-consumption (Tertullian, *Ad Uxor.* ii. 5; Cyprian, *De Orat.* ch. xix.); and we find that they were sometimes sent by bishops and priests to each other as tokens of communion and charity at Easter (Irenæus, *Fragm.* iii.; *Concil. Laod.*, can. xiv.). This practice might, or might not, have been edifying, but we see what it was. The warm love of the early Christians could not bear that an absent brother should be deprived of his share in the sacred feast through sickness, or because he would be unable to attend at the next meeting of the con-

gregation, and therefore some part of the consecrated elements was kept for them—in the first case, sent to them by the church officers, and in the second, carried away by themselves—and they loved to show the unity of the Christian body by interchanging the elements consecrated at the altars of one and another church, or of the churches of one and another diocese, as an indication that "we are all partakers of that one bread" (1 Cor. x. 17). "The state of things at first," says Burnet, "made it almost unavoidable: they neither could nor durst meet all together, especially in the times of persecution; so some parts of the elements were sent to the absent, to those in prison, and particularly to the sick, as a symbol of their being parts of the body, and that they were in the peace and communion of the Church" (*Expos. of Art.*).

On the other hand, the Reservation which existed at the time of the Reformation, and which exists now, has for its object something quite different. Its purpose is to form and keep a local presence of Christ, in His Flesh and Blood, but under the form and appearance of bread, in each church in which the host is reserved. There He could be seen, though under the veil which He chose to adopt. There He could be bowed down to. There He could be worshipped close at hand. And growing out of this idea came the modern form of devotion, the *Quaranta ore*, when the devotees combine to adore the Lord present in His Sacrament unceasingly for forty hours, one relay of worshippers relieving the other; and again, the Perpetual Adoration, when this worship is constantly kept up in the same manner.

The idea of Reservation for the purpose of keeping a continual local presence of Christ in the material Church is the

natural result of the doctrine of transubstantiation. For if Christ's natural Body and Blood—if He Himself can be found apart from reception and from the faith of the receiver, why should He not be thus constantly reserved for the worship of His followers? Why should Christians be without His bodily presence, which they can themselves create?

And yet this worship of Him carnally and materially present in the material Church, what is it but a parody of the true idea of spiritual worship offered to Him spiritually present in His spiritual Church? Spiritual worship lifts the soul up and up to the highest heavens, where dwells the glory of God, whom no man hath seen, or can see, in light unapproachable. Material and carnal-minded worship brings down, or fancies that it brings down, its deity from the heaven of heavens, places it close before the worshippers, and says, See, it is He: adore Him! And the feeble faith which demands this degradation of the object of worship, flutters down into lower and lower depths of superstition; while the brave, strong faith, which dares to launch itself upwards towards that which it cannot see, elevates its possessor and lifts him up with itself till he breathes the atmosphere which surrounds the very throne of God.

The reservation of the ancient Church, although liable to many objections, did, in fact, witness against transubstantiation, while the modern practice known by the same name springs out of it. For it is inconceivable that if the early believers had held that that bread and that wine were Christ Himself, they would have sent and carried it about and made presents of it to each other as tokens of brotherly union. We see in foreign churches the little loaves that have been blessed distributed among the congregation for the people to take

away with them after a mass has been celebrated; but is it imaginable that the consecrated hosts should be so distributed? No; when the theory of transubstantiation has been adopted, it becomes impossible. On any theory, the practice was open to the dangers of sacrilege and profanity, and therefore, as soon as the first love of Christians had cooled, and when necessity could no longer be pleaded for it, it was well that it should be given up. It was indeed always the exception, not the rule. The usual habit seems to have been for the clergy to consume all the consecrated elements that remained over (pseudo-Clement, *Epist.* ii. *ad Jac.;* St. Jerome *in* 1 *Cor.* xi.). At Constantinople the theological students consumed them (Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 36). Sometimes they were burnt (Hesych. *in Levit.*). It is not till the end of the ninth century, when transubstantiation was now beginning to creep in, that we hear of a pyx being ordered to be set on the altar for holding the Body of the Lord (*Labb. Concil.* viii. 34; ix. 1271). Even yet, however, it is only as "a viaticum for the sick," "a viaticum to those departing out of the world," that "the Lord's Body" is ordered to be "stored" in it. The time had not yet come for the Lord's Body to be exhibited for the sake of being worshipped or of giving benediction. That would be when the doctrine of transubstantiation had fully established itself, as it did after the Lateran Council, A.D. 1216.

The Fathers, following and interpreting Scripture, formally deny the fact of the bodily presence of Christ on earth, on which the practice of the later Reservation rests. St. Augustine says, "In regard to His majesty, His providence, His ineffable and invisible grace, the promise, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world,' is fulfilled; but

in respect to the flesh which the Word took that other saying is fulfilled: 'Me ye shall not always have with you.' How so? Because He went in and out with His disciples forty days in respect to bodily presence, and, while they accompanied Him with their eyes, but could not follow Him, ascended into heaven, and is not here. For He is there: He sits at the right hand of the Father; and He is here, for by the presence of His majesty He has not gone away. In other words, according to the presence of His majesty, we have Christ always; according to the presence of the flesh, it was rightly said to His disciples: 'Me ye shall not have always.' For the Church had Him, according to the presence of His flesh, for a few days; now she holds Him by faith; she does not see Him with the eye" (Tract. *in S. Johan.* vi. 13).

St. Cyril of Alexandria: "Although He be absent from the world in regard to His flesh, He nevertheless will come again to those that are in Him, and His Divine and ineffable nature will be over all" (*In Evang. S. Johan.* vi.). And again, "Although He is absent from us in the flesh, having departed unto the God and Father, yet by His Divine power He governs all things and is present with them that love Him" (*Ibid.* ix. 21).

Vigilius Afer, A.D. 484: "He is both with us and not with us; for those whom He left, and from whom He departed in His humanity, He neither left nor forsook in His Divinity. For through the form of a servant, which He withdrew from us into heaven, He is absent from us; through the form of God, which does not depart from us, He is present to us on earth" (*Contra Eutych.* i.).

Other passages of like nature will be found in Origen,

Fulgentius, and, in more or less clear language, in almost all the Fathers. But, says Scudamore, "Had the contemporaries of Origen and St. Augustine held the modern Roman view of Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist, they could not have spoken thus without incurring the charge of heresy. It would certainly have been said to them—Granted that He went away in the flesh on His ascension, yet you forget that in that same flesh, in its very substance, form, and matter, He is still present to His Church as literally and truly as before; and *that*, not in one place only, as then, but on every altar in Christendom. According to the Roman doctrine, the human nature of Christ is continually and everywhere present on the earth, *i.e.* whenever and wherever the Holy Eucharist is celebrated. Can it for a moment be doubted that writers who could use such language as we have now cited would have been among the foremost, had they now lived, to accuse the modern Church of Rome of confounding the properties of the Divine and human natures in our blessed Lord, when she teaches and affirms that in His human nature—in the true substance of His soul and body—He can be and is present on many altars at the same instant of time?" (*Notitia Eucharistica*).

The ancient form of Reservation, then, (1) is incompatible with transubstantiation; (2) is doctrinally innocent; (3) sprang out of the necessities of the times. The modern form of Reservation (1) springs from transubstantiation; (2) is doctrinally heterodox; (3) embodies an idea totally different from that of the ancient Reservation. The modern practice cannot, therefore, justify itself by appealing to the ancient practice, which it resembles only in name.

In the Church of England, Reservation has been authori-

tatively forbidden, and an attempt to reintroduce it, though in its least objectionable form, was prohibited in 1885 by the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury. After a careful consideration of the question by a Committee of the whole House, the Bishops of the Southern Province declared "that the practice of Reservation is contrary to the wise and carefully revised order of the Church of England as expressed in the Book of Common Prayer," and that "no Reservation for any purpose is consistent with the rule of the Church of England" (*Journal of Convocation*, Feb. 3, 1885).

CHAPTER XVIII.

"In 1230, Juliana, a nun of Liége, while looking at the full moon, saw a gap in its orb, and, by a peculiar revelation from heaven, learned that the moon represented the Christian Church, and the gap the want of a certain festival—that of the adoration of the Body of Christ in the consecrated host—which she was to begin to celebrate and announce to the world" (Hook's *Church Dictionary*). Such is said to be the origin of the festival of *Corpus Christi*, in which the *sacramentum*—the consecrated element of bread—is "carried about" in procession as though it were the *res sacramenti*—the Body and Blood of Christ, or rather Christ Himself in His full Divinity and humanity.

That such an origin should be assigned for such a practice is noticeable, for it is not an indifferent ceremony; it is a practice teaching a doctrine, which was made popular by it. So other practices involving doctrine originated, such as devotion to the dolours of St. Mary, from a supposed revelation made to St. Bridget; and the worship of the Sacred Heart, from a revelation alleged to be made to St. Mary Alacoque. Thus we see that doctrines, or practices involving doctrine, are allowed to receive their sanction in the Church of Rome, not only from Holy Scripture, not

only from tradition, but from the visions of women regarded as saintly.

Juliana's vision was, however, more the occasion than the cause of the institution of the festival, and was itself the result of an already operating cause which produced both vision and ceremony. For, as we have seen, in the year 1215, the dogma of transubstantiation was enunciated at the Lateran Council as the doctrine of the Western Church, and from this doctrine sprang *first* the practice of Reservation (in the mediæval sense of that word), and *then* the practice of carrying the reserved Host in procession. If that which is in the pyx is the Person of Christ, why should He not have His royal progresses, like other Eastern kings, saluted as He goes by prostrate multitudes, and honoured with the clang of music and the melody of song? What wonder that, till this was done, Juliana should see gaps in the moon and have revelations as to their meaning? In 1264, Pope Innocent IV. instituted the festival. Thus it took a short half-century for the dogma of transubstantiation to produce the practice of the Procession of the Host. And as the doctrine created the practice, so the practice propagated the doctrine. To this day, the procession on this festival is one of the most popular in the Roman calendar, and few travellers can have failed to be struck by the joyous appearance that it puts on in Roman Catholic countries. The first warmth and brightness of summer are just come, and the little children dressed in their white gauzy frocks, the various confraternities vying with each other in their numbers and their costumes; the floating banners, the measured progress, and occasional pauses for prayer, the chanting priests and the royal canopy overshadowing the supposed presence

of the descended Deity, are adapted to create an impression on the imagination of the vulgar, and of the young, not easily removed.

Though the "carrying about of the sacrament" culminates in the procession of *Corpus Christi* day, it is not confined to it. In every Roman Catholic country, when the law of the land permits it, "the Sacrament," under the name of the Host, is carried in procession to the sick, instead of being consecrated in the sick man's house, every one that meets it being required to salute it by at least baring the head. This, too, as well as the procession of *Corpus Christi*, is condemned by the twenty-eighth Article. The difference of the ceremonial observed in it from that which prevailed in the Early Church, when the sacrament was sent to the sick, is sufficient in itself to indicate the difference of the doctrine of the Church in primitive times and its doctrine after transubstantiation had been adopted as a dogma. No ceremony was used at all in the first ages. As we have seen in the last chapter, the consecrated elements were sent sometimes by a deacon (Justin Martyr, *Apol.*), sometimes by a boy (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* vi. 44), and St. Jerome speaks of their being carried in a wicker basket and a glass (*Epist.* xv. *ad Rusticum*). This absence of ceremony in the first and second centuries teaches one lesson as plainly as the magnificent processions of the Middle Ages teaches another.

It is not only on the festival of *Corpus Christi*, and in going to visit the sick, that the *sacramentum*, or outward sign of the Lord's Body, is carried in procession as though it was the Lord Himself. When once the doctrine of transubstantiation had come to be accepted, it was but natural thus

to get the Divine presence in all cases of danger. Instead of lifting up his heart to Christ in heaven, the man who was in peril sent for Him from the next church. We may take as an illustration F. von Matthisson's well-known account of the chamois hunt of the Emperor Maximilian the First. Maximilian, the story runs, pursuing a chamois amidst rocks, found himself in a place where he could move neither backwards nor forwards. His retinue was in the valley beneath, but could not help him, and after two days and nights spent in vain efforts to extricate himself, the Emperor made up his mind to die. We should naturally expect to hear that, with this object, he raised his soul to God, and submitted to His will. But no! We read, "So stark als es nach so langer Abwarterung möglich war, er rief zu den Seinen, kommen zu lassen die Priester mit dem heiligen Sakrament und ihm solches zu zeigen;" that is, "he called as loud as he could to his attendants to get the priests to come with the holy Sacrament and show it to him." Instead of placing himself by an effort of his spirit in the presence of God by a brave act of faith launching itself upwards, he calls for his object of worship, and summons it into *his* presence. It was quite natural, but we cannot but see how unspiritual is the conception which underlay the Emperor's demand. He cannot transport his soul to Christ, but Christ, under the form of the *sacramentum*, must be brought to him.

A second consequence, then, of the doctrine of transubstantiation is the carrying about the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, as though it was Christ, on the festival of *Corpus Christi*, in visiting the dying, and in succouring those in danger.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE third result of transubstantiation is the Elevation of the Elements after consecration. This practice commenced in the West in the thirteenth century, and has continued since that time in the Roman Church. What is the evidence as to the existence of the practice before that date? Holy Scripture does not contain the slightest indication of it. We read that our Lord took bread and gave it to His disciples, and that He took the cup—one of the cups of the Paschal Feast—and gave it to them. It is not imaginable that He first held them up for the worship of His disciples before they ate and drank them, and yet that no word of such an astonishing act should have been spoken by the Evangelists or by St. Paul. Nor is it possible that such a thing could have been done without its becoming the universal practice in the first century, and therefore in all subsequent centuries. But Cardinal Bona acknowledges "it is not clear what was the first origin in the Latin Church of the Elevation of the sacred Mysteries as soon as they were consecrated. For not any trace of it is found in the ancient Sacramentaries, or in the Codices of the Ordo Romanus, whether printed or manuscript, nor in the old expositors of rites, Alcuin, Amalarius, Walafrid, Micrologus, and others" (Lib. ii. c. xiii.). We can fix the date of its introduction. It was the year 1179 in which it is first

heard of. In that year were framed the Constitutions of Odo, Bishop of Paris, and they contain the following injunction, which is the first notice of the practice to be found: "Presbyters are ordered, when they have begun, 'Who in the same night,' etc., holding the Host, not to raise it too much at once so as to be seen by the people, but to keep it about at the level of the breast until they have said, 'This is My Body,' and then to raise it so as to be seen by all" (Labbe and Cossart, tom. x. 1808). Contemporaneously with, or a little subsequently to, the growth of the belief in transubstantiation grew up the practice of elevating the Host for worship, and it was enforced as a protest against the sounder views of Berengarius and the upholders of the older theology. Odo was the first to regulate it, and this he did eighteen years before the authoritative enunciation of the dogma of transubstantiation, which took place in 1215. Eleven years subsequently to the Constitutions of Otho, Guido, a Papal Legate in Germany, made a further step towards the modern custom by enjoining the use of a bell at the time of the Elevation, and desiring the congregation to prostrate themselves at its sound till after the consecration of the Cup (Cæsarius Heisterbacensis, *Historia*, ix. 51). These injunctions were repeated by William, Bishop of Paris, in 1228 (Hard., *Conc.* vi. 1979), and by a Synod of Worcester in 1240 (Wilkins, i. 667). Throughout the thirteenth century the command to elevate is reiterated again and again for the purpose of insinuating the new doctrine, and Gregory IX. introduced it into the Decretals, by which it acquired binding force in the Latin Church. The connection between Elevation and Transubstantiation and Adoration is exhibited by a declaration of a Synod of Exeter in 1287. "Because by these

words, 'This is My Body,' and by no other, the bread is transubstantiated into the Body of Christ, let not the Priest elevate the Host until he has brought out those words, lest the creature be worshipped by the people for the Creator" (Wilkins, ii. 132). No doubt, the main purpose with which Elevation was first introduced, and has since been maintained, in the Latin Church, is to give occasion of worshipping the *Sacramentum*, presented to the people no longer as a *Sacramentum*, but as Him of whose Body it is the outward sign. And, in fact, we see that those who have been brought up in the Roman Catholic faith, are deeply impressed by the ceremonial. When the bell rings and the priest lifts up the dimly seen Host, a hush sinks down upon the congregation, while the people fall upon their knees and worship what they believe to be a present and visible Deity. If Transubstantiation be true, and Adoration of the Sacrament be right, then Elevation is a most natural and appropriate ceremony.

There is another practice which Elevation naturally accords with—that of "gazing" on the sacrament instead of partaking of it. In the Latin Church this is called "hearing Mass;" in England it is known under the name of "non-communicating attendance." The logical result of this practice is Adoration of the Sacrament, but it is often allowed and adopted by those who are not prepared to worship the consecrated elements. It is thought by some that "gazing" on the Mysteries is adapted to create a reverential frame of mind suitable for prayer, and therefore that it is at least a harmless and perhaps an edifying custom; by others it is defended on the plea that it takes away the discomfort coming from timidity that is felt by those who for the first time approach the Lord's Table. These and other like topics may be urged

by the advocates of the practice; but those who adopt it for such reasons must be men of great simplicity of mind. The effect of it, whether intended or not, and whether understood or not, must be to abolish the idea that reception of the consecrated elements is the necessary condition of deriving benefits from the Holy Communion, and to substitute for it the idea that presence at the time that the Priest consummates the Unbloody Sacrifice and offers Christ to His Father is the essence of the Rite, reception being a further and, so far as the sacrifice is concerned, an indifferent act following after the act of sacrifice. The reasoning on which this practice is founded is unsound, even if we regard the sacrificial side of the Holy Communion alone, and it ignores those other aspects of the rite—the Feeding on Christ, the Incorporation, the Pledge.

The Jewish sacrifices were of four kinds—the Burnt-offering, the Meat-offering, the Sin and Trespass-offering, and the Peace-offering. Of these, the Sin-offering and the Burnt-offering typified and shadowed forth the Sacrifice of Calvary, when the great self-surrender was made, man's sins expiated, and God's wrath against sin propitiated. The Meat-offering set forth the same thing as the Eucharist, in so far as the latter is an acknowledgment to God of His goodness in the gifts of creation. The Peace-offering answers to the Holy Communion as the Sacrifice or Gift, which signified that the worshipper was in peace with God. Now, of the Peace-offering, it was necessary that the offerer should eat in order that the sacrifice should be accepted (Lev. vii. 18; xxii. 30). They that *ate* of the sacrifices were partakers of the altar (1 Cor. x. 18), that is, it was by eating of the victim that men took part in the sacrifice. This was the recognized rule of

the Paschal Sacrifice. Presence was of no avail without participation in the lamb; whoever failed to eat a part of it was "excluded as if he had not been in the mind of him who slew the victim" (Maimonides, *Tract I. de Pasch.* c. ii.). Bishop Andrewes dwells with emphasis on this point. "It is," he says, "an Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the law of that kind of sacrifice is this—that the offerer must partake of it, and he must partake of it by taking and eating, as the Saviour enjoined, for your 'partaking by praying' is modern and new-fangled, newer even than your private Masses" (*Resp. ad Bell.*, p. 250). "The Law of a Peace-offering is, he that offers it must take his part of it, eat of it, or it doth him no good" (*Serm.* iv., *Of the Resurrection*). "I see not how we can avoid that the flesh of our Peace-offering must be eaten in this feast by us, or else we evacuate the offering utterly, and lose the fruit of it" (*Serm.* vii., *Of the Resurrection*). In accordance with this teaching, the Church of England declares, "In such only as worthily *receive* sacraments, they have a wholesome effect or operation" (Art. XXV.).

The restoration of Holy Communion in place of Hearing Mass or Non-communicating Attendance, which had been substituted for it, was vital to the Church of England at the time of the Reformation. Accordingly, in the Prayer-books of 1552, 1559, 1604, and 1637, she addressed the following warning to her children: "Whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you that to this unkindness ye will not add any more; which thing ye shall do, if ye *stand by as gazers and lookers on* them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same yourselves. For what thing can this be accounted else than a further contempt and unkindness unto God? Truly

it is a great unthankfulness to say nay when ye are called; but the fault is *much greater* when men stand by and yet will neither eat nor drink this Holy Communion with others. I pray you, what can this be else than but even to have the mysteries of Christ in derision? It is said unto all, 'Take ye and eat;' 'Take, and drink ye all of this;' 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' With what face, then, and with what countenance, shall ye hear these words? What will this be else but a neglecting and despising and mocking of the Testament of Christ? Wherefore, rather than ye should do so, *depart you hence*, and give place to them that be godly disposed."

In like manner, in the Second Book of Homilies published in 1562, she says, "Our loving Saviour hath ordained and established the remembrance of His great mercy expressed in His Passion in the institution of His heavenly Supper, where every one of us must be guests, and not gazers; *eaters, and not lookers*. To this His commandment forceth us, saying, 'Do ye this; drink ye all of this.' To this His promise enticeth, 'This is My Body, which is given for you: this is My Blood, which is shed for you.' So, then, we must be ourselves partakers of this Table, and not beholders of others" (*Hom.* xv., *On the worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper*).

These exhortations, and the spread of knowledge respecting the practice of the Primitive Church on the point in question, had the effect of breaking off the mediæval custom of Hearing Mass, and of substituting for it a true communion of faithful recipients. Bishop Overall's nephew, J. Hayward, whose *Notes on the Prayer-book* have been erroneously ascribed to Bishop Cosin, and are published among his works,

commenting in 1618 on the passage quoted above from the Prayer-book, says of it, "A religious invective added here, against the lewd and irreligious custom of the people then nursed up in popery, to be present at the communion, and to let the priest communicate for them all, from whence arose the abuse of private Masses—a practice so repugnant to the Scripture and to the use of the ancient Church, that at this day not any but the Romish Church throughout all the Christian world are known to use it, as the Greek, Syrian, Armenian, and Ethiopian Liturgies do testify; nay, the Roman Liturgy itself is herein full against the Roman practice" (Cosin's *Works*, vol. v., *Angl. Cath. Lib.*).

In the century which elapsed between 1552 and 1652, the habit had become so obsolete that in the Revision of 1662 the Church did not feel it necessary to repeat her warnings against it, nor was the practice again heard of for two centuries. At the end of that period, that is, about 1860, it was reintroduced under the name of Non-communicating Attendance, under the mistaken belief that it was allowed and approved by the early Church. In 1868 Bishop Moberly had to write against it as follows:—

"You well know," he says, "with what uniform and consentient agreement the Fathers of the English Reformation disallowed, as a thing never known of nor permitted amongst the Fathers of the Primitive Church, the practice of private Masses, which had grown up into a vast mass of corruption and superstition in the preceding ages; and yet if the sacrifice is complete and entire by the single action of the sacrificing priest, I know not how private Masses should be otherwise than things good and holy and of precious efficacy towards the Christian benefit and spiritual rejoicing of all the faithful

members of the Body of Christ. . . . The observations which I have made upon the primitive doctrine of Holy Communion, as excluding the Roman practice of private Masses, appear to me to tell with not less force against the recently introduced usage in some churches of the Anglican communion, of persons of adult age, and confirmed, who are therefore capable of communicating, remaining in the church during the time of the celebration, and witnessing without partaking of the sacrament. Is it supposed that this is a primitive practice? Is it not certain that St. Chrysostom speaks of it in the severest terms when adopted, apparently as a new thing, among the careless and imperfectly instructed churchmen of Constantinople in his own days? And if other denunciations of it are seldom found in the writings of other ancient Fathers, is not the true explanation of the absence of such denunciations to be found in the fact that such an usage was absolutely unknown and unthought of in the early Church? And does it not militate directly against the very fundamental idea of the commemorative sacrifice, as the great and solemn offering on the part of the whole Church, that men should thus not refrain only, but exhibit, in a sort of presumption of will-worship, the fact of their determination to refrain from communion? Is it not, in fact, a part of the natural result—of the logical consequence —of the Romish doctrine, which regards the entire sacrifice as completed by the sacrificing priest singly and alone, and ignores the necessary though subordinate part which the Church in her faithful people contributes to the joint act? The only possible place which a faithful lay-Christian, or, I would add, a priest not celebrating, can rightly have when the Holy Eucharist is celebrated, is the place of a com-

municant. If there be reasons and causes personal to himself why he should not on the particular occasion communicate, the same reasonable causes require his absence from the celebration. 'I say not these things,' says St. Chrysostom, 'in order that ye should partake any how (ἁπλῶς), but that ye should make yourselves worthy. Art thou not worthy of the sacrifice, nor of the participation? Then neither art thou worthy of the prayers. Thou hearest the crier who standeth and saith, 'Depart, all ye who are in penance.' All that do not partake are in penance. If thou art one of those who are in penance, thou must not partake; for whosoever doth not partake is one of those who are in penance. Consider,' he goes on to say—'consider, I beseech you. The King's table is spread; angels are ministering at the table; the King Himself is present; and dost thou stand gaping by? He speaketh these words to all who stand shamelessly and boldly by. Tell me, if any man invited to a feast should wash his hands and sit down, and be ready for the board, and then refuse to partake, does he not insult the giver of the invitation? Were it not better that such an one should not be present at all? In such a way thou didst present thyself. Thou didst sing the hymn; amid all the rest thou didst acknowledge thyself to be one of the worthy, by not having withdrawn along with the unworthy. How is it, then, that thou didst remain, and yet partakest not of the table?' (*In Ep. ad. Eph.* c. i., Hom. iii.). It is indeed very possible that there is this great difference between the conduct of those whom St. Chrysostom refers to and of those who do the like in the present day—that while in the former case it may have been merely a fashion of carelessness and neglect, it is in the latter the effect of theory, and intended as re-

verence. But I do not see that the argument is the less applicable to the one case than to the other, even if this be so, while the theory exemplified in the modern practice is precisely that against which it is my particular purpose to object" (*Bampton Lectures*, 1868).

In like manner Bishop Christopher Wordsworth in 1873: "No one who observes the present condition of some foreign Churches can doubt that the encouragement of what is called 'spiritual communion' and 'perpetual adoration' has tended to supplant and supersede the reception of the Holy Communion, and to confirm the erroneous dogma of transubstantiation, and may therefore be not uncharitably called a device of the Evil One acting with insidious subtlety by means of persons having holy intentions in their minds, and holy words in their mouths, and endeavouring by their agency to alter and impair the Divine character of the Holy Eucharist, and to deprive the Church of the heavenly nourishment which Christ bestows in that Holy Sacrament. But anything that is a breach of Christ's law cannot be otherwise than offensive to Him. And this growing practice of 'Non-communicating Attendance' calls also for strong reprobation, as tending to immoral results. It is a compromise between God and the World, and seeks to reconcile the two. Actual reception of the Holy Communion has this practical benefit among others—that it demands previous strict self-examination, and godly repentance, and the forsaking of sin, and holy resolutions of amendment, as indispensable prerequisites for that reception. But 'Spiritual Communion' and 'Adoration' require no such moral preparation. They exact no turning away from the world, the flesh, and the devil with remorse and shame, and turning to

God with the whole heart; and yet he who *spiritually* communicates and adores is flattered by others and himself with the fond imagination that he is performing a religious exercise of high and holy devotion. Verily, as the wise man says, 'there is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death'" (*Twelve Addresses*).

From the other side of the Atlantic, Bishop Doane, in 1887, warns "those to whom, on various grounds of sentiment and expediency, the dangerous proposition is made to use a Divine institution otherwise and for other uses than its Divine Founder established it for." "I beg the clergy to notice," he says in his Convention Address, "that it is wrong to encourage any idea of benefit derived from the Holy Communion except by those who not only take part in the offering, but also partake of the elements. The rule stands, and stands by Divine institution, by Catholic usage, by the plain intention of our Book of Common Prayer. Any habit formed by the lay-people or encouraged by the clergy to attend celebrations often, with the idea of sacramental benefit or spiritual advantage, is a violation not merely of the Church's rule, but of the Divine Law."

The following are passages quoted by Scudamore (*Notitia Eucharistica*, xiii. 2) from the Fathers, to show that we commemorate the sacrifice of Christ only when we partake of the appointed symbols of His Body and Blood. "St. Basil: 'We must *eat* the Body and drink the Blood of the Lord for a memorial of His obedience unto death' (*Moralia*, *Reg.* xxi. ciii.). St. Augustine: 'Christians celebrate the memorial of that same accomplished sacrifice by the most holy oblation *and participation* of the Body and Blood of Christ' (*Contr. Faust.* xx. 18). 'We call that only the

Body and Blood of Christ which, taken from the fruits of the earth and consecrated by the mystic prayer, we duly *receive* to our spiritual health for a memorial of the Lord's Passion for us' (*De Trin.* iii. 4). St. Cyril of Alexandria: 'The Table with the Shewbread signifies the Unbloody Sacrifice, through which we receive blessing when we *eat* the Bread from heaven' (*De Adorat. in Spir. et Ver.* xiii.). 'The *participation* of the holy Mysteries is a true confession and commemoration of His dying and rising again for us' (*Comm. in S. Joh. Ev.* xx. 16)."

Mr. Scudamore concludes his review of the subject with the following impressive words: "Those who do not communicate derive no special benefit from their presence at the celebration. The Sacrifice is not imputed to them because it is only through partaking that any one can appropriate it to himself. The Altar must be to us the Table of the Lord also, or it ceases to be an Altar. Rather may we not fear a further secret loss of grace and blessing if we attempt to use the most holy ordinance of Christ in a manner or for a purpose which has no sanction from Holy Scripture or from the uninspired records of the Primitive Church?" (*Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 402).

It will be seen that I have spoken in this chapter of the act of Elevation as it is practised in the Western or Latin Church. I have done this in order to avoid a confusion of thought which might arise from a practice of the Eastern Church sometimes known under the same name. In most of the Oriental Liturgies it is enjoined that after the Lord's Prayer, which in these Liturgies follows the Prayer of Consecration and precedes the Fraction, the Priest shall say

"holy things for those that are holy," and, as he says it, shall lift up the consecrated elements. But this is a totally different ceremony from that of the Latin Church. It is done within the iconostasis, the doors of which are closed. Consequently the congregation do not see the action at all. It cannot therefore be done in order that they may the better "gaze upon" or "worship" the Host. It is a ceremony in which the holy things (*i.e.* the consecrated gifts or elements) are taken up and laid down again in a reverential manner, and that only in the presence of the ministers at the altar within the Bema. This Elevation (if it may be so called) not being the "lifting up" which resulted from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but a harmless ceremonial rite, I need not dwell upon it further than to point out the distinction that exists between it and the Western practice.

CHAPTER XX.

THE fourth practice condemned in the XXVIIIth Article is the Adoration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. This practice is the natural and direct product of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. If the Sacrament be Christ, how should we not worship it? If it be only the appointed means of conveying Christ to the duly qualified soul, how should we? In the latter case, it would be as reasonable to worship the water made use of in the Sacrament of Baptism which is the means of conveying the Holy Ghost to the duly qualified recipient; in the former case, who could refuse to worship?

The arguments in favour of Adoration are of two classes: (1) Arguments founded on the ambiguous use of the word "adoration;" (2) Arguments boldly advanced in defence of Adoration as ordinarily understood.

Controversialists who take the first line put together the passages where the word "adoration," or "worship," is used in an inferior sense; *e.g.* Gen. xxiii. 7, "Abraham bowed himself to the people of the land," which in the Vulgate version is *adoravit populum terræ;* 1 Kings i. 16, "Bathsheba did obeisance to the king," *adoravit regem;* Esther iii. 2, "The king's servants reverenced Haman," *adoraverunt Haman.* The common title of a magistrate—"Your worship"—is quoted, and the passage in the Marriage Service—"With

my body I thee worship "—is cited. What do these passages prove? That if the word "adore," or "worship," be used not in the sense in which it is now ordinarily used, but as it was occasionally used three centuries ago, then it may be applied to the Sacrament, for there is no doubt that it should be treated reverently. And so Ridley, "We do handle the sign reverently. There is a deceit in this word *adoramus*. We 'worship' the symbols when reverently we handle them" (*Works*, p. 236). But the word is not now used in the meaning which it occasionally had three centuries ago; and if it be used in that meaning without explanation, it must mislead. The fallacy at the bottom of arguments of this nature is the assumption that because a word may be innocently used in one sense, it may be used in another sense which is not innocent. All that can be allowed to disputants of this class is that they may use the word "adore," or "worship," if invariably they append to the use of the word the parenthetical explanation that it is employed in the antique sense of "reverence." If this be done, it will at once be seen that no argument for the Adoration of the Sacrament, in the accepted sense of the phrase, has been advanced, but only that attention has been drawn to a change that has occurred in the meaning of a word in the course of three centuries.

I proceed to the real defence of the practice of the Adoration of the Sacrament. This can be only based on the idea that the Sacrament either is Christ, or contains Him under the form of bread and wine; in other words, it requires the assumption of the truth either of Transubstantiation or of Consubstantiation. With one of these two hypotheses, or some other hypothesis so similar as to be practically undis-

tinguishable from one or the other of them, stands or falls the practice of Eucharistic Adoration. But Transubstantiation has been already shown to be untenable, and the same will appear as to Consubstantiation. Nay, more; even if these hypotheses were accepted as true, the practice would even still be idolatrous, for the worship offered could not be dissociated from the accidents of bread and wine, which are not God, even if their *substratum* were supposed to have become Divine.

The difference between the worship of God in heaven and the worship of Christ in the Sacrament is the difference between a spiritual and an unspiritual religion. What is the *moral* purpose of the prohibition to worship God under any visible form contained in the Second Commandment? Bishop Moberly has pointed out in a most valuable little work, less known than it ought to be—the *Law of the Love of God*—that the tendency to seek after some visible representation of the Unseen God is the result of a feeble faith. A brave, bold faith launches itself outwards and upwards, and soars as in a moment to the throne of God. But a weak faith cannot do this. It falls back, flags, droops, and then it cries out for some nearer object of worship, to reach which will not be so great an exertion, to apprehend which will not need so prolonged an effort. This is the *rationale* of image-worship, icon-worship, and the worship of the Sacrament.

Is there anything in Holy Scripture to justify the practice? Let us go back to the night of the Institution. The first and second cup of the Paschal Supper had as usual been drunk, and the body of the lamb, which served as a memorial of the lambs sacrificed in Egypt, had been eaten; and then

our Lord took some of the bread lying on the table, and gave it to His disciples to eat, saying, "Take, eat; this is My Body" (just as the Paschal lamb was the body of a lamb slain in Egypt). Is it imaginable that before eating it the disciples worshipped it as being, or as containing, God? Then, after a pause, He took the wine that was on the table, and which was always ceremonially drunk—either the third or the fourth cup of the feast—and gave it to them to drink, saying, "Drink ye all of it," and using words which showed that it was henceforth not to be a mere part of the Paschal Supper, but a memorial of His blood-shedding. Is there any indication of their worshipping it first? Or again, when it was the custom to combine the feast of Charity with the Lord's Supper, and a portion of the offerings brought for the first were taken and consecrated for the Lord's Body, do we find that the latter were worshipped? On the contrary, we find that great scandals arose from the Corinthians not distinguishing between the Lord's Body (*i.e.* the consecrated part of the gifts) and the remainder, and St. Paul had to rebuke them sharply for their irreverence. Would such confusion between the sacred elements and the unconsecrated food have been possible if the Christians' practice had been to worship the former?

Next, as to the teaching of the Early Church, we have seen that the Fathers of the first two centuries and a half regarded the Holy Communion as an offering of praise and thanksgiving, and an oblation of bread and wine in thankful recognition of God as the Giver of food to man and the Sustainer of his life. In other words, they looked on the presentation to God of bread and wine in the Holy Communion as the Jews looked on their meat (*i.e.* flour) offering—

as a gift offered to the Creator out of His own, symbolically acknowledging that all came from Him and His bounty. Can we imagine the Jews worshipping the flour that they presented through the priest as a meat-offering? Can we imagine the early Christians worshipping what was to them an earnest or representation of the food of man, which they offered to God in thankful acknowledgment of His goodness in supplying their bodily and spiritual necessities?

When, after the year 250, the idea of a commemoration of Christ's Body broken, and Blood shed, which had never been absent from the rite, began to supersede the more primitive view of an offering of a portion of the fruits of the earth to the Creator and Sustainer, the possibility of confounding the symbol and the thing symbolized became for the first time possible. But no such confusion was, in fact, made for another 300 years. Rhetorical expressions were, however, used which led not unnaturally to error. St. Ambrose, whose want of early theological teaching occasionally exhibits itself, finding the words "fall down before His footstool" in Ps. xcix. 5, translated in the Vulgate Version "*Adorate scabellum ejus*," thought it necessary to find an explanation for the apparent injunction to worship God's footstool. Seeing that elsewhere the earth was called God's footstool, he asked himself how it could be right to worship the earth, and came to the strange conclusion that as God's footstool meant the earth, so the earth meant the Flesh of Christ, which, he says, "we worship (adoramus) in the mysteries" (*De Spir. Sancto*, iii. 11). St. Augustine, knowing no more than St. Ambrose the real translation of the original, and led by the authority of his master, interpreted the words in the same strange fashion (Enarr. *in*

Psal. xxxviii.), while at the same time protesting strongly against materialistic views of the Sacrament. What sense those doctors assigned to the word "worship," in the passage in which they had been led into error by their ignorance of Hebrew, it is difficult to say. Probably they meant no more than that Christ's Person, in His Flesh, and His Soul and Divinity, was an object of worship, and that His Flesh was sacramentally—*i.e.* in a sign—manifested in the Holy Communion; or they might have used the word "worship" in its lower signification, as meaning reverential treatment. But it is plain that their words might be easily misunderstood, and they may have given support to the error which began to spring up a few centuries later, and developed itself *pari passu* with Transubstantiation. There was "no adoration of the Host," says Bingham, "before the twelfth or thirteenth century" (*Antiquities of the Christian Church*, xv. 5).

It is not necessary to quote the words of the English Reformers on this point; for there is not one of them that does not condemn the practice. Allowing the use of the word "adoration," when employed in the sense of reverential treatment, they point out that it is inexpedient to use an ambiguous expression (see Ridley, as quoted above), and they deliberately and firmly set down their united judgment in what is called the Black Rubric, first appended to the service for the Holy Communion in the time of Edward VI., and restored at the last revision. "It is hereby declared that, by kneeling, no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there (in the Lord's Supper) bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very

natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians); and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here, it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

"Any counsel," says a living American Bishop, "to use the Holy Sacrament not as a means to worship God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in heaven, but as a shrine in which to see and worship Christ, contains false doctrine and a corrupt practice" (Bishop Doane, *Convention Address*, 1887).

CHAPTER XXI.

Fasting Communion, as it is understood by many in the present day, is a natural result of the two doctrines of the Sacrifice of the Mass and Transubstantiation. I say, as it is understood by many, for there are two grounds quite distinct each from the other on which the practice is justified or recommended. Some find the habit a help in bringing their own minds into a proper state of reverence and devotion for the holy rite. If experience proves that in their case the custom is a good one, by all means let them persevere in it, provided that they do not thereby injure their health or encourage themselves or others in superstitious or heterodox imaginations, and provided that they are able to do so without turning the weekly festival of the Lord's Day into a fast.

But there is another view on which this practice is not only defended, but insisted upon. According to this view, it is irreverent and wrong to allow any food to enter the stomach before that which is considered to have become, not only to the soul and to faith, but to the teeth and to the digestive organs, the Body of the Lord. Why, upon this principle, it should be more irreverent that ordinary food should precede the taking of the Body of the Lord than that it should immediately succeed it, does not appear, but so it is arbitrarily laid down.

That Fasting Communion, as ordinarily understood, is not scriptural is demonstrable. Let us look first at the institution. Our Lord and His Apostles had eaten the bitter herbs and the Paschal lamb, and had drunk two cups of wine in accordance with the ceremonial of the Paschal Supper, when our Lord took the bread that was upon the table, and one of the cups which had still to be drunk as part of the Paschal Feast, and having consecrated them as memorials of His Body broken and His Blood shed, gave them to be eaten and drunk by His Apostles. They therefore were not fasting.

Again, the Epistle to the Corinthians shows us that it was the practice of St. Paul's converts to eat the feast of Charity (consisting of unconsecrated food), and also the bread and wine which had been consecrated as the Body and Blood of Christ, at the same time, carefully discerning the one from the other, or committing the gravest sin if they did not so discern them. At what time in the feast of Charity the reception of the sacred elements took place, cannot be proved; but it is probable, as is pointed out by Cave (*Primitive Christianity*, Part I., ch. xi.), that, in imitation of our Lord's action at the Paschal Supper, it took place towards the end rather than at the beginning of the feast; and this, too, is indicated by St. Paul's reproval of the Corinthians for not tarrying one for another, which implies that they began their feast of Charity before all were assembled, whereas the sacred part of the feast would not have taken place until the whole congregation was gathered together. Moreover, St. Paul's injunction, that if they were hungry they should eat at home, would probably mean that they were to eat, in case they were hungry, before coming to the

feast of Charity, at which the Holy Communion was also dispensed. Again, the custom of celebrating the Holy Communion late at night, after an evening service, of which we have an indication in Acts xx. 7, is incompatible with Fasting Communion in the latter sense of the words.

The testimony of early Church history is on the same side. Perhaps the most ancient document that we have is the newly found "Teaching of the Apostles." In this treatise, fasting is enjoined upon adult candidates for baptism before they are baptized, but no such injunction is given in respect to the other sacrament, the description of which indicates that the practice, which we have seen prevailing among the Corinthians, of combining the Love-feast and the reception of the sacred elements was still continued, the Thanksgiving Prayer being offered after the conclusion of both feasts.

While there is ample proof of fasting being required before adult baptism in the early ages (see Bingham, x. 2), there is no evidence of Fasting Communion being a practice in the Church (I say this after a careful consideration of all the passages usually alleged on the other side) until the close of the fourth century. Then it would appear that there was an ecclesiastical rule enjoining that the clergy and laity should be fasting at the time of reception. Here we have to consider two things—(1) What is the meaning of the word "fasting"? (2) Whether or no a regulation of the fourth century respecting a matter of discipline is binding at the present day?

(1) The rule of the Roman Church, as may be seen in the Trent Catechism, Part II. 4, 44, is that no food be taken from the previous midnight until the time of reception. This rule was first formulated by Thomas Aquinas,

A.D. 1270; and it is evidently grounded upon a principle laid down by Bartholomew, of Brescia, in 1250, that a person is fasting when the digestion of his previous meal is complete. In passing, let it be noticed that the man who was the great advocate for Transubstantiation was also the author of the modern rule of Fasting Communion. But in the earlier Church, fasting did not mean an entire abstention from food from the previous midnight; it meant such moderate use of food as would best prepare a man for communion with God in prayer. In the fourth century, the ordinary meals were taken at about the same hours as at present in many parts of the world, that is, there was a slight early refection called "jentaculum," a *déjeûner* at about ten or eleven called "prandium," and an evening meal called "cœna." A man was regarded as fasting as long as he was "impransus," that is, until he had taken his "prandium" or luncheon. Thus we see the meaning of the first rule of Fasting Communion ever issued in the Church of Christ. This was done by the local Council of Hippo, in the year 393, to this effect: "That the Sacraments of the Altar be not celebrated save by fasting men," the anniversary being excepted on which the Lord's Supper was instituted; "for if the commendatory of any dead persons, whether bishops or others, must be held, let it be done with prayers only, if those who hold it are found to have dined or lunched." At the end of the fourth century, then, it was the practice, if not the rule, of the Church, that the Holy Communion should not be administered after luncheon except on Maundy Thursday, when, in memory of the circumstances of the institution, it was allowed even after dinner. This practice or rule we find referred to by St. Augustine, who desired that

men should not come to receive the Sacrament "pransi aut cœnati," that is, after early or late dinner, and says that it was always received by fasting men; and St. Chrysostom denies with great vehemence that he had given the Holy Communion to men after they had eaten. St. Chrysostom's words are so strong that it is not surprising that they have been misunderstood by those who content themselves with extracts and do not look to the context. "If I have done any such thing," he says, "let my name be blotted out of the roll of bishops, and not be inscribed in the book of the orthodox faith; for behold, if I have done any such thing, Christ shall also cast me out of His kingdom." But in the very next sentence St. Chrysostom declares that there is nothing wrong in itself in so doing, since St. Paul had baptized a whole household after supper, and our Lord had given the communion to the Apostles after supper. It is plain, then, that in St. Chrysostom's eyes the fault of administering to people not fasting consisted in its being contrary to the then rule of the Church. The vehemence of the words which he uses may be perhaps explained by their being a quotation from the cry raised against him by his adversaries, "Let his name be blotted out of the roll of bishops," etc. Very possibly he may himself have regarded the practice of administering after luncheon with the same disfavour that many among us now regard evening communion. That his objection did not arise from any idea of impropriety or irreverence in the juxtaposition of unconsecrated food and the sacred elements, is made plain by his placing the administration of Baptism and the Eucharist upon the same footing. If it was wrong to administer the Eucharist, so also was it wrong to administer Baptism, to

men not fasting. The object of the Church rule existing in the time of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom, plainly was to bring about that disposition of mind on the part of the recipients which would make them meet partakers of that holy sacrament, and would save them from the risk of coming unworthily when surfeited with food and wine.

(2) We have next to consider whether a rule, because it was a rule of the fourth century, is binding on the Church of the nineteenth century. Here we must make a careful distinction between matters of faith and matters of discipline. The faith changes not. Disciplinary regulations change according to circumstances, and by the will of those who have authority to impose or abrogate such regulations. One instance is sufficient in proof. The Nicene Council desired that men should stand instead of kneel on Sundays and in the season between Easter and Pentecost. No one would dream of the Church of the present day being bound by that regulation, even though we cannot point to any law abrogating the Nicene injunction. St. Augustine says, "Let there be *one faith* in the inner life of the whole Church in every place, although the unity of the faith is blended with varieties of ritual. For 'the King's daughter is all glorious within: her clothing is of wrought gold.' The Church is beautiful in the unity of her inner life of faith, and this inner beauty is not blemished, but rather adorned, by the embroidered needlework of ritual variety" (*In Psal.* xlv.). The obligation of a precept which is solely a positive precept rests upon the duty of obeying those in authority in matters indifferent. Church authority in the first century determined that the Holy Communion was to be received after food. It was right therefore for Christians

of the first century so to receive it. Church authority in the fourth century determined that the Holy Communion was to be received before luncheon, or, as it was otherwise expressed, by men who were fasting. It was right therefore for Christians of the fourth century to receive it before luncheon, and to refuse, as St. Chrysostom did, to administer it after luncheon. A precept which is simply positive may without hesitation be abrogated or varied by those in authority. A precept founded upon moral considerations may also be varied, but on the condition that the moral end in view be still attained, although by other means. If the rule of Fasting Communion be regarded as not merely a positive but also a moral precept, we know that that end was to put a stop to abuses and scandals such as exhibited themselves in the Church of Corinth, and to cause, so far as regulations could do so, a reverent state of mind on the part of the recipients. If this end, then, be kept in sight, any reasonable alterations may be made by due authority.

To sum up—the ordinary practice of English Churchmen of communicating after breakfast and before luncheon is as closely assimilated to the practice of the Early Church as a change of habits admits. Primitive Christians communicated after their "jentaculum" before their "prandium;" and because they communicated before their "prandium," they were regarded as receiving "impransi," or fasting. English Churchmen ordinarily communicate after their breakfast and before their luncheon; and because they communicate before their luncheon, they would have been regarded by the early Christians as receiving "impransi," or fasting. The only difference is that the modern Church-

men receive somewhat later in the day than the ancient Churchmen, because modern and Western habits have made the day practically begin and end later than it did in ancient times, and still does in the East. Further, we may observe that had the change been greater than it is (for it is infinitesimal), yet the modern Church would have been fully justified in making it, provided that it kept in view the main object of the regulation, viz. the maintenance of a reverent state of mind on the part of the recipient, not disturbed by the effects of food and drink lately taken.

"Our Blessed Lord," says Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, "did not institute the Holy Communion fasting (Luke xxii. 20). The Primitive Church hallowed its daily food by receiving the Holy Communion after it (see Pearson in *Acta Apost.*, Lect. iii.). In subapostolic times, it became usual to receive the Holy Communion very early in the morning (Pliny, *Epist.* x.). At the close of the fourth century, it was the practice of the Church to receive the Communion before any other food (see St. Aug., *Epist.* liv.). If we had lived in those days, our duty would have been to conform to this rule of the Church. We need not scruple to say that any members of the Church of England who, on the plea of reverence for the authority of the ancient Church, venture to require fasting as a condition of administering and receiving the Holy Communion, not only set themselves up against the authority of the Church of England, which, for the most part, administers the Holy Communion at midday or even later on Sunday, but even against that *ancient* Church to which they appeal" (*Twelve Addresses*).

"Anything is wrong," says Bishop Doane of Albany, "which makes compulsory a new condition, and adds fasting to the faith and repentance and charity which are laid down as preparations of worthy receiving" (*Convention Address*, 1887).

CHAPTER XXII.

ANOTHER practice which grew up contemporaneously with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and as a logical result from it, is the Denial of the Cup to communicants. Such a thing had not been heard of in the Church, except, indeed, to be condemned as a heresy by Pope Gelasius, until the twelfth century. At the beginning of that century a step was taken in the direction of the practice, by giving the bread dipped in wine to the communicant instead of offering him each of the elements separately—a thing that had never been done before, except in the case of sick persons and infants incapable of swallowing the bread in its dry state. This combination of the elements was forbidden by Pope Paschal in the year 1110 (*Epist.* xxxii. *Ad Pontium;* Mansi, xx. 1013), who desired that they should be administered separately, as they were separately instituted by Christ. Ten years later, Ernulphus, Bishop of Rochester (*Epist.* ii. *Ad Lambertum;* D'Achery, *Spicileg.* iii. 470), is found arguing for the new custom, on the plea—afterwards commonly urged—that otherwise some of the wine would probably be spilt if taken by people with moustaches, and might possibly be spilt even by smooth-shaven men and by women. The practice of mixing the elements was forbidden in England by a Council held in London in the year 1175 (c. xvi.).

For the further step of forbidding the Cup, only two authorities are found as early as the twelfth century. These are Rudolph, Abbot of Saint Trone, in the territory of Liège, in the year 1130, who proposed the innovation on two grounds—first, lest the wine should be spilt; and, secondly, lest the laity should suppose that "the whole Christ did not exist in each species." The latter argument was derived from Anselm, who was the first to affirm that "the whole Christ was taken under either species" (*Epist.* iv. 107). The other authority in the twelfth century is Robert Pulleyn, in the year 1140, who gives the injunction that "the Flesh of Christ alone should be distributed to laymen" (*Sentent.*, p. viii. c. iii.). The Schoolmen, as a rule, as yet supported the traditional practice of communicating in both kinds, but they had a difficulty in explaining why both kinds should be required, when, according to Anselm's dictum, Christ existed equally in either. Peter Lombard suggested that the bread had reference to the Flesh, and the wine to the Soul, of Christ, for which reason both should be received, and this view was commonly adopted for a certain period. Even still Gratian did not hesitate to adopt and convert into a law of the Church (which was immediately abrogated) the statement of Pope Gelasius—that men must either receive in both kinds or not at all, for that division of one and the same mystery could not be made without great sacrilege.

In the thirteenth century this hesitation disappears. Transubstantiation had now been declared a dogma of the Church, and its logical consequences were more boldly defended. Alexander of Hales, in the year 1220, declared it to be sufficient to communicate in the bread alone, inas-

much as Christ was received under each kind; and in order to prove his point, he tells a tale of some monks who desired to communicate in both kinds, but were convinced of their error by seeing the paten on which a priest broke the host filled suddenly with blood, which retired again when the priest rejoined the parts of the broken host. From this time forward this sort of miracle became very common, taking place wherever laymen clung obstinately to their ancient privilege. Another device for weaning people from their old habit and inducing them to accept the innovation was that of giving unconsecrated wine in place of consecrated (see Council of Lambeth, held in 1281; Lindwood, *Prov. Anglic.*, p. 9). Alexander of Hales, however, still regarded it as more meritorious to receive under both kinds, though not necessary and no longer customary (*In Sentent.* lib. iv. qu. 53). Albert the Great and Durandus (*Rat. Div. Off.* iv. 54) were still in favour of both kinds; but Thomas Aquinas ruled that one kind was sufficient for the laity, provided the priest took both (*Summa Theol.*, p. iii. qu. 76, 80); and Bonaventura argued on the same side, on account of the risk of the wine being spilt and because laymen would not otherwise believe that the whole Christ was received under one kind. The authority of these two doctors closed the question, but yet it was not till the beginning of the fifteenth century that a Council of Constance could publicly sanction the practice by the following decree:—

"Since there are some who presume audaciously to assert that the Christian people ought to take the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both kinds of bread and wine, and commonly communicate the laity not only under the species of bread, but also under the species of wine . . . although

this sacrament was received in the Primitive Church by the faithful in both kinds, nevertheless, henceforth let it be received by the officiating priests in both kinds, and by the laity only under the species of bread, inasmuch as it is most firmly to be believed, and no way to be doubted, that the whole Body of Christ and His Blood are truly contained as well under the species of bread as under the species of wine" (*Sess.* xiii., A.D. 1415).

From this historical review we see that the practice of the whole Western Church was revolutionized in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and that for this revolution two reasons were assigned: the first, that there was danger of spilling the consecrated wine; the other, that Christ was contained in either species equally. With regard to the first of these, it may be asked, Whether there was any reason why the consecrated wine should be more likely to be spilt in the twelfth or thirteenth century than in the previous eleven centuries? And this question being answered in the negative, the further question arises, Why it should have been considered so much more heinous an offence in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries than before? The reason was the conclusion that Anselm had drawn from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, namely, that Christ in all the integrity of His Divinity, His human soul, His Body, and His Blood, was contained in each of the elements, in the bread separately, and in the wine separately. If this were so, most embarrassing questions must arise, which not even the subtlety of the Schoolmen could answer. If a part of the wine adhered to the moustache or otherwise was not swallowed, what was it? Natural reverence shrank from saying that it was a part of Christ, and yet what else could

it be? By the use of wafers, it became possible to guard against the fall of crumbs, and therefore in the administration of the bread the difficulty did not arise, or at least did not force itself upon the notice of the communicants; but if the wine were administered, it could neither be concealed nor answered. Therefore the administration of the wine was given up, in deference to the logical needs of the new faith, although it had been commanded by Christ and practised by the Church for more than a thousand years. Anselm's proposition follows necessarily from Transubstantiation. If the bread be changed into Christ when the priest utters the word of consecration and holds up the Host for adoration, Christ must be in the Host in His integrity, and the same is true with regard to the wine. This being so, it became unreasonable to give Christ to the communicant twice over in different forms—once must be sufficient, and if the practice of Christ's Apostles and of the universal Church had been otherwise, it must be corrected. There is a ring of dogged determination in the wording of the decree of the Council of Constance, which seems to witness to a secret consciousness on the part of its framers that they could find no justification either in Holy Scripture or in the earlier Church for the innovation in practice which novelty in belief had caused, and consequently that they must rest it solely on the basis of their own authority.

The Scriptural and historical evidence on this point is irrefutable. Before the Institution, if our Lord spoke of the necessity of eating the Flesh of the Son of Man, He spoke in the same breath of the necessity of drinking His Blood (John vi. 53-56). At the Institution, if He gave bread to

the disciples, saying, "Take, eat," He also gave the cup to them, saying, "Drink ye all of it" (Matt. xxvi. 26, 27). And here we may remark that the injunction to drink of the cup is specifically made of universal obligation, while that universality is implied only, not expressed with regard to the bread, and accordingly the Evangelist states that "they all drank" of the cup, while he does not pause to make a similar statement with respect to the bread (Mark xiv. 23). So in the account of the Institution imparted to St. Paul, drinking the cup is put upon a level with eating the bread as the means of "showing the Lord's death" uninterruptedly "till He should come again" (1 Cor. xi. 26). There is an indication, indeed, not amounting to a proof, that in the first century the cup was, occasionally at least, partaken of before the bread, for St. Paul speaks of the cup of blessing before the broken bread (1 Cor. x. 16), and of drinking the cup of the Lord before he speaks of partaking of the Lord's Table (1 Cor. x. 21); and in the ancient document called "The Teaching of the Apostles," the Eucharistical prayer is ordered to be offered first in respect to the cup, and then in respect to the bread.

With regard to the practice of the Early Church, Bellarmine acknowledges that no examples of communicating in one kind can be found in the first five hundred years except it were in one of four classes: (1) converted Nazarites; (2) Manichees; (3) those who had taken home with them a small part of the Eucharist; (4) the sick. Of the existence of the first class there is no evidence whatever; the second supply no precedent for Christians; in the third case, those who had reserved a part of the bread for private consumption were not regarded as communicating afresh when they

eat it, but as consuming that which remained from the sacred feast in which they had participated, nor is there any proof whether or no they were in the habit of reserving wine also; in the fourth case, wine was administered with the bread. That these are the only examples that Bellarmine can adduce, shows what was the constant practice of the Church.

The following are the essential parts of Bishop Andrewes' argument against Bellarmine on the subject:—

"Christ, says the Cardinal, instituted the Eucharist, in so far as it is a sacrifice in both elements, in so far as it is a sacrament in either of the two. For the essence of a sacrifice, he says, both are required, neither can be absent; if one be absent, the sacrifice is mutilated. For the essence of a sacrament, either of them is enough; which you please of the two is sufficient; either one or the other may be away, and yet the Sacrament is not mutilated. This is magisterial enough, but it is the arbitrary dictum of the Cardinal. What Father says so? Where is the appeal to the first five hundred years?

"Under the species of bread, says the Cardinal, the Sacrament is entire; under the species of wine, the Sacrament is also entire, and yet these two entire Sacraments are not two entire Sacraments, but only one entire Sacrament. Nay, more surprising still, under the species of bread there is the Sacrament, under the species of wine there is also the Sacrament, and yet they are not two Sacraments, and nevertheless they *are* two Sacraments; they are not two, but one, if haste is used—if a man takes them together at one time; they are not one, but two, if there is delay—if a man takes them at two separate times, or if two people take them at one time. When they are taken together, they are two

parts of a whole, neither of them is itself a whole; when they are taken separately, they are two wholes, neither of them is a part—and so a part is equal to the whole. He receives as much who takes either element by itself as he who takes both at the same time. Who can understand this?—'one not one,' 'two not two,' 'two wholes taken together are not two,' 'two are one if taken together,' 'two are not two unless taken separately.' Why should the Sacrament be affected so much by time when it is not affected by place?

"Then I have this inquiry to make: Why, on the theory that the Blood is always with the Body, and the Body with the Blood, should the Sacrifice be regarded as mutilated unless both kinds are present, and the Sacrament not? What becomes of the Cardinal's doctrine of Concomitance? In the Sacrifice he rejects it; let him reject it therefore in the Sacrament. But in the Sacrament he will not do so. '*There*,' says he, 'either one of the two is sufficient,' just as if Concomitance was kept at the door while the Cardinal was offering the Sacrifice, and called in as soon as it had been finished. How are these things to hold together?

"In fact, the Sacrament is no more than the partaking of the Sacrifice; for the Sacrifice here offered is a peace-offering and Eucharistical. 'Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they who *eat* of the Sacrifice partakers of the altar?' (1 Cor. x. 18). And as the Sacrifice is not perfect unless the Body is broken and the Blood shed—but the Cardinal himself confesses it mutilated—so neither is the partaking of the Sacrifice perfect unless we *receive* both the broken Body and the Blood shed. The Apostle finds the symbol of the Body in 'the bread which we break;' of the Blood in 'the cup

which we bless.' Reception of the bread is partaking of the Body; the cup is the communication of the Blood. A little below he says, 'Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils,' regarding the drinking of the cup with as great solicitude as the eating of the bread. But if the Sacrament is perfect, as you say, under the species of bread, why is the priest, when he comes to taking the Sacrament, not content with that which is perfect? Why should he take more than that which is already perfect? Why should that not be perfect for him which is perfect for the people? Or why should he not be contented himself with what he desires them to be contented with?

"There is no analogy between this case and single or trine immersion. There is but one act of immersion in baptism, but there are two acts in the Eucharist—of eating and drinking, and two subjects—bread and wine. Besides, here there is a positive command—there, there is none. Christ gave no command about the number of immersions in baptism, whether it should be once or three times; but He did give a command about both kinds in the Eucharist. He gave an express command—a command expressly obligatory on all. He said, 'Drink,' as well as 'Eat;' and when He said 'Drink,' He added, 'all of you.' If the Saviour had used that word 'all' after 'Eat,' it would have been a great help to the Cardinal's argument. But where Christ gives a command and uses the words of injunction, there there is no room for the Church's legislation, but only in cases where, as in the case of immersion, He leaves it undecided. For if He had said, 'Dip once only,' or if He had said, 'Dip three times,' I suppose the Church would not have changed the rule—nor

would the Cardinal maintain that it would have a right to change it. But He did say, 'Eat,' and He said also, 'Drink,' and 'in like manner;' and He said, 'Do this,' both in regard to one and the other. By saying that, Christ closed the question, nor has the Church the right of leaving open that which Christ closed, nor of ordering that one kind only be received when Christ twice ordered that it should be taken in both kinds, nor when Christ enjoined, 'Do this,' in respect of both, expunging His words in respect to one and forbidding men to 'do it.' We may act as we please where no command has been given; but when He gives the command 'Drink,' 'Drink ye all,'—'Do this,' it is no longer permissible or justifiable to refuse obedience" (*Resp. ad Bellarminum*, p. 251).

CHAPTER XXIII.

I WILL mention one other corollary on the doctrine of Transubstantiation. This is the tenet of the Eating the Body of Christ by the wicked. If it be true that the Bread is objectively, physically, and substantially changed into the Body of Christ, so that, according to Anselm's doctrine, the whole Christ is received under the form either of the Bread or of the Wine, and if this change takes place on the pronunciation of the words of consecration without respect to the faith of the recipient, it cannot but follow that whosoever eats the consecrated Bread, whether he be good or bad, must eat the Body of the Lord. Nay, not only does it follow that wicked men must receive Christ when they consume the wafer, but that brute creatures must do so also, if, as sometimes happens, mice should find their way to the reserved Host, or other animals should accidentally swallow it, or have it thrown to them by wicked men. On the contrary, if faith be "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is taken and received in the Supper," then it is impossible that it can be eaten by the wicked, because one of the two conditions of the Bread becoming to the recipient the Body of Christ is wanting. The Church of England, therefore, is consistent with itself when, having denied Transubstantiation, and having declared that "the Body of Christ is given, taken, and

eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and the mean whereby the Body of Christ is eaten and received in the Supper is faith" (Art. XXVIII.), she adds (Art. XXIX.), "The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ."

Our Lord's words appear to prove the truth of this statement. He says, "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day" (John vi. 54). But we know that the wicked man hath not eternal life, therefore he does not eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood. Again, "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood dwelleth in Me, and I in him." But the wicked man does not dwell in Christ, nor Christ in him, therefore he does not eat His Flesh nor drink His Blood (John vi. 56). And in the next verse: "He that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me." Therefore whosoever eats Him has life, and whoever has not life hath not eaten Him.

It is argued that St. Paul teaches otherwise when he writes, "Whosoever shall eat this Bread and drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord" (1 Cor. xi. 27); and again, "He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, if he discern not the Lord's Body," that is, if he distinguish not the consecrated from the unconsecrated feast (1 Cor. xi. 29). But these words clearly will not bear the weight of the argument built upon them; for seeing that the Bread and Wine are the symbols of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and the means of conveying them to the recipient, whoever receives them

unworthily is undoubtedly "guilty of sin in regard to the Body and Blood of the Lord," and brings judgment on himself if, like the Corinthians, he confounds them with the constituent parts of an ordinary feast.

It is plain that Origen understood our Lord's words in the sense above assigned to them, for he says, "The Word was made Flesh and true Food, which whoso eats shall assuredly live for ever; but no wicked man can eat it, for if it were possible for a man remaining in his wickedness to eat Him who is the Word made Flesh and Living Bread, it would not have been written that whoever eats that Bread shall live for ever" (*Comment. in Matt.* xv.). Similarly St. Hilary: "The Bread which comes down from heaven is only received by him who has the Lord, and is a member of Christ" (*De Trin.* lib. viii.). And St. Jerome: "None that are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God eat the Flesh of Jesus or drink His Blood, for He Himself says, 'Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life'" (*In Isa.* lxvi. 17). And St. Augustine: "Christ's words are as though He said, he who does not abide in Me, and I in him, let him not say or think that he eats My Body or drinks My Blood" (*De Civit. Dei*, xxi. 25).

The question of the reception, or the non-reception of the Body of Christ by the wicked and by brute creatures, resolves itself into the further question, whether the priestly consecration does or does not make the consecrated Bread to become Christ objectively, locally, and altogether apart from the faith of the recipient. Passages in the ancient Liturgies are relied upon in which prayer is made that the Holy Spirit will cause the Bread and Wine to become the Body and Blood of Christ. It is impossible to tell at what date these passages were inserted

in the Liturgies, or reduced to their present form. Another form of the prayer is a supplication that they may become "to us" the Body and Blood of Christ. This formula, which is found in the Roman Mass, shows us how the clause is to be understood where the words are not found, and serves as a protest against the idea of an objective change of nature in the elements. A change no doubt there is, but it is a change in their use and purpose, which purpose is not fulfilled without the further qualification of a living faith on the part of the recipient. There is a very general misunderstanding with respect to the meaning of consecration in relation to *things*. It means that they are set apart for God's service or for the purpose of bringing about some end determined by God. Thus, the consecration of a church does not change the nature of the stones and mortar with which it is built, but sets it apart for a particular use in the service of God. So the consecration of the water in baptism is not intended to change the water into anything else, but to adapt it for its use in washing away sin. In like manner, the consecration of the Bread and Wine makes no change in the nature of the elements, but adapts them for becoming the means of conveying to the duly qualified soul the benefits of the Body broken and the Blood shed upon the cross. The Invocation of the Spirit on the water for holy baptism was as customary in the Early Church as the Invocation of Him on the Bread and Wine for the Holy Eucharist; nay, we have earlier proof of the former than of the latter, and we have stronger expressions as to the effect produced upon the water by "the illapse" of the Holy Spirit than on the Bread and Wine by His illapse upon them. As no one believed that the water was changed into the Blood of Christ or any other material by the Holy

Spirit invoked over it, but only that it was made conducive to the sacred end for which it was employed in baptism, so no one in the purer ages of the Church believed that the Bread was changed into the Flesh of Christ or any other material by the analogous invocation, but only that it was made conducive to the sacred end of Holy Communion.

It may be asked how, then, can it be so grave a sin as St. Paul represents it, to partake unworthily, if that which is partaken of by the wicked is not the Body of the Lord, but bare Bread and Wine? To this we may answer, It is not bare Bread and Wine; although to the unfaithful or to one in malice it is not the Lord's Body, it is yet the Sacrament of the Lord's Body; and he who eats it without faith or in malice "eats to his condemnation the sign or sacrament of so great a thing." Again, although the Bread and Wine are not the actual Body and Blood of Christ, they yet are the means of conveying to the soul, rightly qualified, the benefits of the death of Christ. If, then, they are consumed by one disqualified by want of faith or by malice, he is profanely misusing that which might have been the means of conveying to his soul the spiritual food of the Body and Blood of Christ. On both these grounds the sin of the unworthy communicant is very great before the Lord, making him, in St. Paul's words, "guilty concerning the Body and Blood of the Lord," "eating and drinking condemnation to himself," and bringing upon himself temporal judgments (1 Cor. xi. 30). The profanation of the Sacrament or sign of the Lord's Body by the unworthy communicant is a sin of so awful a nature that it does not require to be made still more terrible by the supposition that Christ's Body is itself given together with its Sacrament.

We have dwelt upon the carrying about, lifting up, gazing upon, and worship of the Holy Eucharist, of the denial of the cup to the laity, and of the belief in the partaking by the wicked of the Lord's Body as the direct consequences of the doctrine of Transubstantiation springing up contemporaneously with and as the results of that doctrine. Bishop Cosin does not speak too strongly when he says, "As soon as ever Transubstantiation was established, a foundation was laid for a number of superstitions and errors which God-fearing men could not sanction or endure; and amongst the believers in Transubstantiation themselves there grew up a forest of questions inextricable and portentous, with which the Schoolmen occupied themselves to such a degree that it may be truly affirmed that a perfectly new and monstrous theology, unheard of by all the ancients, about the Holy Eucharist and the adoration of the Host then took its birth" (*Historia Transubstantiationis*, vii. 22).

The bishop, having made mention of the crop of false miracles which immediately sprang up, sets down some of these "portentous questions" as follows: "Whether mice eat the very Body of Christ when they nibble the reserved Hosts which have not been carefully locked up? Whether, if a dog or pig should swallow the whole of a consecrated Host, the Body of the Lord would not pass into their stomachs with the species? To which some of them answer that, though the Body of Christ cannot enter the mouth of an animal *as food* for his body, yet it does enter *with the species*, because one cannot be separated from the other (not knowing what they say), for they argue that as long as the species of bread continues to exist, so long the Body of Christ remains inseparably with it. Others answer that brute animals

cannot eat the Body of Christ *sacramentally*, but that they do so *accidentally*, as a man would who took a consecrated Host not knowing that it was consecrated. Another question is about Hosts which become corrupted or mouldy. To this they answer that the thing cannot happen, but that it only seems to do so, the Body of Christ being incorruptible. Another question is about undigested Hosts, to which the answer is that the Body of Christ is inseparably connected with them, the contrary opinion being condemned by Gregory XI. . . . Further, this doctrine of Transubstantiation has given occasion to wicked men of treating in a shameful manner what they believe to be the Body of Christ. There have been bad priests who have sold consecrated Hosts to Jews or magicians, by whom they were pierced or burnt or used for incantations. Nay, we read that St. Louis himself delivered a Host to the Turks and Saracens as a pledge of his fidelity. But who can believe that our Lord Christ willed to institute a Presence of His Most Holy Body in His Church of such a nature that He Himself or His Body could be given into the hands of unbelieving Jews and Turks, or could be swallowed by dogs and mice, or cast into the fire, or burnt, or used for magical incantations? I cannot go on. I shudder at what I have already quoted" (*Ibid.* 24).

CHAPTER XXIV.

ANOTHER method by which it has been supposed that men may be able to feed upon Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is that which is implied in the theory of Consubstantiation. This means not that the substance of the Bread and Wine is removed, and its place taken by the substance of Flesh and Blood—which is required by the tenet of Transubstantiation—but that, the Bread and Wine continuing still in their own substance or nature, there is added to them the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, so that both substances coexist in the consecrated elements. The origin of this tenet seems to have been, first, a desire to define and explain what Scripture has left as a mystery; secondly, a desire to accept and interpret the words, "This is My Body, this is My Blood," in the most literal way possible; thirdly, a desire to retain the doctrine of an objective Presence, while avoiding the physical and metaphysical difficulties and self-contradictions of Transubstantiation.

No doubt it does obviate some of those difficulties. We are no longer required to believe in the permanence of accidents after the substance in which they inhere has been removed, and we are no longer required in so flagrant a manner to reject the evidence of our senses; but, on the other hand, it has difficulties of its own from which the theory of

Transubstantiation is free. If it be impossible by a law of our mind to believe in the existence of accidents apart from their substance, so too is it impossible to believe in the co-existence of two substances under the phenomena, and with the accidents of only one of the two. This is evidently demanded by the theory of Consubstantiation; for the phenomena of bread, and of bread only, are present, and yet there are supposed to be underlying them two substances, to one only of which they belong. The other substance, therefore, on this hypothesis, has no phenomena at all. This would be sufficiently difficult to understand—nay, self-contradictory—even on the supposition that the theory of Realism were true. Without Realism it has intellectually no ground at all to stand upon, and philosophically it is self-condemned.

The Scriptural foundation for the doctrine is as defective as its philosophical basis. For we have already seen that the words, "This is My Body, this is My Blood," *need not* mean that the bread and wine are materially flesh and blood, and *do not* bear that meaning in the present case.

The origination of the doctrine is generally attributed to Luther. It is probable that it was held by many before him. Certainly some of the expressions used by the later Fathers are more in accordance with the doctrine of Consubstantiation than of Transubstantiation or of the spiritual Presence; but these writers did not define their views, while Luther, having on the one side to repudiate the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and desiring on the other to cling to the tenet of an objective Presence, was driven into formulating the doctrine known by the name of Consubstantiation. But the word "consubstantiation" was not adopted by him or by

his followers. The phrase authorized by the Confession of Augsburg is that "the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to the communicants in the Supper of the Lord" (Art. X.); and the *Formula Concordiæ* teaches that "the Body and Blood of Christ are truly and substantially present in the Supper of the Lord." The *Catechismus Major* says that "the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are in and under the Bread and Wine by the word of Christ," and the Lesser Catechism has teaching to the same effect. Melanchthon softened the teaching of Luther, and brought the Lutheran doctrine nearer to the tenet of a spiritual Presence, so that Hooker was able to contemplate the likelihood of an agreement between the earlier school of the Calvinists and the Lutherans in all essential points (*Eccl. Polity*, v. 67). "The Lutherans," says Waterland, "when pressed to speak plainly, deny every article almost which they are commonly charged with by their adversaries. They disown assumption of the elements into the humanity of Christ, as likewise augmentation and impanation—yea, and consubstantiation and concomitancy; and if it be asked at length what they admit and abide by, it is a Sacramental union, not a corporal Presence, but as a body may be present spiritually" (*Doctrine of the Eucharist*, chap. viii.). In accordance with this view, Buddæus has written, "Sacramental union is the one true, genuine mode of the Real Presence, the nature of which is that, according to the institution of our Saviour Himself, the Body is united to the bread blessed as a Divinely appointed means, and the Blood of Christ is united to the wine blessed as a Divinely appointed means, in a way that reason cannot comprehend, so that in a sublime mystery we take and eat the Body of

Christ together with that bread in one sacramental act of eating, and we take and drink the Blood of Christ together with that wine in one sacramental act of drinking" (*Miscellan. Sacr.* ii. 86). Dr. Waterland, anxious to take as favourable a view as possible of Lutheranism, supposes this to mean little else than "a mystical or moral union, as to virtue and efficacy, and to all saving intents and purposes. So far, both parties (Lutherans and Calvinists) are agreed; and the remaining difference may seem to lie chiefly in words and names rather than in ideas or real things—but great allowances should be made for the prevailing prejudices of education, and for a customary way of speaking or thinking on any subject" (*Ibid.*).

The origin both of Consubstantiation and of Transubstantiation appears to have been a restless desire on the part of the human mind to explain the manner of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament on the assumption of a material, or at least an objective, Presence. If we believe in a local, external, objective Presence, the conclusion to which the logical faculty pitilessly drives us is either Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation. Aquinas adopted the first. Luther, abhorring Papal doctrine, and yet resolved to maintain the objective Presence, fell back upon Consubstantiation. Many individuals who profess belief in a local, objective Presence hold neither Transubstantiation nor Consubstantiation, but this is because their reasoning faculty has not compelled them to draw conclusions from their premises.

It will be well to examine into the history of the word "objective" as thus employed. Until about two centuries ago, the words "objective" and "subjective" were used interchangeably, or the word "objective" was specifically used

for that which is now termed "subjective." About the middle of the seventeenth century a German school began to use the word "objective" for that which exists externally to the mind of the percipient, and "subjective" for that which owed its existence to the notions of the mind. Coleridge introduced this distinction into English philosophy, and it has been seized upon by theologians and imported by them into the science of theology. But let it be noted (1) that it is not a Scriptural term; (2) that it is not used by the Fathers; (3) that it is an ambiguous term used in various and sometimes contradictory senses; (4) that it is a philosophical, not originally a theological term; (5) that even if it should continue to be used in the sense in which it is at present used, which is not probable, it would yet be inadequate as applied to the Holy Communion. An objective Presence would be a Presence brought about in the elements by the act of consecration. But consecration is only one of two conditions under which we have a right to expect that the Sacred Presence will be vouchsafed. The other condition is reception by a duly qualified soul. On the other hand, the term "subjective Presence" is equally inexact, for though it might be applied to a Presence brought about by a due qualification of the human soul, it does not take into account the other condition of the Presence, viz. consecration. Let both conditions be fulfilled, and we may be assured of the Sacred Presence. Let either of them be absent, and we have no such assurance. Both of the words therefore—"objective" and "subjective"—should in this connection be avoided. Christ's Presence cannot rightly be described as objective, for it depends upon the state of the recipient's soul; nor can it rightly be called subjective, for

it depends upon something external to the mind of the communicant. It is safer to retain the recognized terminology of the Church, and not to corrupt it by an attempt at enriching it by words gathered in the fields of German philosophy.

Hooker, holding what would now be called by many the subjective view, does not make use of that misleading name. He writes, "The Real Presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth—*first*, 'Take, and eat,' *then* 'This is My Body;' *first*, 'Drink ye all of this,' *then* followeth, 'This is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ when and where the Bread is His Body or the Cup His Blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them. As for the sacraments, they really *exhibit*, but (for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them) they *are* not really, nor do really *contain* in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow" (*Eccl. Pol.* v. 67).

Between the "objective" doctrine attributed to the Fathers—not the present doctrine known by that name—and the "subjective" doctrine said to be Hooker's, Dr. Mozley remarks that "there is some but no very wide interval" (*Lectures*, p. 207).

The doctrine of the Real Presence—a phrase used by Hooker in the above passage, and well known in Anglican theology—is not to be confounded with the tenet of an Objective Presence which is of recent introduction, having sprung up within the last fifty years. The two things differ

essentially one from the other. The doctrine of the Real Presence defines nothing as to place, manner, time. It does not define whether the Presence of Christ is to be looked for in the elements, or in the heart, or in both; whether it is brought about by consecration, or by faith, or by both; whether it is vouchsafed at the moment of consecration, or of reception, or at some other time. The tenet of the Objective Presence defines all these things, and defines them in a sense which Hooker would not admit. It defines the place to be the elements, the manner to be consecration (alone), the time to be that of the pronunciation of the words, "This is My Body," or else the Invocation of the Spirit. These are the very points which the historical school, with which the Real Presence was a favourite watchword, refused in so many words to define; and because they were defined by Transubstantiationists, it rejected the hypothesis of Transubstantiation in favour of an hypothesis which did not define and determine the where, the how, and the when of Christ's Presence. The believer in an objective local Presence in the elements teaches that the Body and Blood of Christ are introduced into the elements before and apart from reception. The believer in a Real Presence is satisfied with the formula, "The inward part or thing signified is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

CHAPTER XXV.

HAVING put aside the doctrine of the Church of Rome known by the name of Transubstantiation, and the Lutheran doctrine which commonly goes under the designation of Consubstantiation, as being, though in different degrees, erroneous representations of the mode in which we feed upon Christ in the Lord's Supper, we come to the doctrine of the Church of England, which teaches that we *spiritually* feed upon Him in that Sacrament. I have already indicated the passages in the Liturgy and Formularies of the Church which represent the Holy Communion as the means of feeding on Christ. The following passages show that that feeding is, in the mind of the Church, *spiritual* in its nature. "He has given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our *spiritual* food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament" (*First Exhortation in the Communion Service*). "For then we *spiritually* eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood" (*Third Exhortation*). "Feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving" (*Form of Administration*). "Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries with the *spiritual* food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ" (*Thanksgiving Prayer in the post-Communion*). "The Body and Blood of Christ which are verily and indeed

taken and received *by the faithful* in the Lord's Supper. . . . The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ" (*Catechism*). "To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. . . . The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, *only after a heavenly and spiritual manner;* and the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith" (Art. XXVIII.). "In no wise are the wicked partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing" (Art. XXIX.). The above passages show what is the mind of the Church of England in respect to the manner in which we may feed upon Christ. "It teaches," says Bishop Harold Browne, "that Christ is really received by faithful communicants in the Lord's Supper, but that there is no gross or carnal, but only a spiritual and heavenly Presence there—not the less real, however, for being spiritual. It teaches, therefore, that the Bread and Wine are received naturally, but the Body and Blood of Christ are received spiritually" (*Exp. of the Articles*).

The Scriptural argument may be shortly stated. It is certain that when our Lord spoke of Himself as the Bread of Life (St. John vi.), He meant that He was spiritually, not carnally, Bread. When He said at the institution of the Lord's Supper, "This is My Body," it is certain that the words taken by themselves are as open to a spiritual as to a carnal interpretation, and that, taken in connection with the events that accompanied them, the carnal interpretation is excluded. It is certain that the words of St. Paul, in the

Epistle to the Corinthians, which have been forced into the support of the material hypothesis, do not bear any such meaning. It is plain, too, that the general tone and tendency of the Apostolic teaching delivered to us in the New Testament is in its spirituality more in accordance with the spiritual than with the carnal hypothesis.

The patristic teaching amounts to this. There are some passages to be found in the Fathers which might have been written by men who held the theory of a material feeding on Christ in the Eucharist, but those passages are susceptible of an interpretation which makes them accord with the theory of spiritual eating; whereas there is a series of passages which teach the doctrine of spiritual feeding, but will not bear the sense of a material eating. A freedom of expression is sometimes found which may be accounted for by the supposition that the danger of misinterpretation in the direction of materialism had never occurred to the writers. Whether this be the rightful explanation of such words, or whether it might have been that individuals may here and there have adopted carnal views, it may be affirmed that the general or Catholic teaching of the Church for the first thousand years was to the effect that the *faithful* Christian was *spiritually* nourished and fed upon Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

But it is important to know with some exactness what we mean by the word "spiritually." It does not simply mean non-naturally or supernaturally, for thus men might still believe in the carnal delivery to them of the Body of Christ, brought about in an extraordinary or miraculous manner, which is only an undeveloped form of the theory which finds its realization and logical outcome in the tenet either of

Transubstantiation or of Consubstantiation. Still less does it mean unreally, for then spiritual reception would be no reception at all. The word "spiritual" is not merely a negation of natural, nor is it a negation of real; it has a positive meaning of its own. This is, in the present connection, that the Body and Blood of Christ are conveyed to the recipient in such manner as spirit communicates with spirit. An object is spiritually fed upon, not by being carnally eaten, but by being inwardly digested, and so supplying strength to the affections and intellect of him who mentally and morally lives upon it. In the Holy Communion we eat the symbolical Body of the Lord, that is, the bread which in a figure represents His Body, naturally: namely, with our teeth, and throat, and stomach. We eat the spiritual Body of the Lord spiritually: namely, by faith and love; and as bread and wine strengthen and refresh that which receives them, namely, the body, when it is in a fit state of health to receive them, so the Body and Blood of Christ strengthen and refresh that which receives *them*, namely, the soul, when it is qualified by faith and love to take and derive benefit from them.

Archbishop Cranmer writes, "You think a man cannot receive the Body of Christ verily unless he take Him corporally in his corporal mouth. My doctrine is—that He is by faith spiritually present with us, and is our spiritual food and nourishment, and sitteth in the midst of all them that be gathered together in His name; and this feeding is spiritual feeding, and an heavenly feeding, far passing all corporal and carnal feedings, in deed, and not in figure only" (*Remains*, vol. iii. p. 288). In the next generation, Bishop Jewell says, "We assert that Christ exhibits

Himself really present in His Sacraments: in Baptism, that we may put Him on; in the Supper, that we may eat Him in faith and in spirit, and have eternal life from His Cross and Blood" (*Apologia*). And Hooker expounds "This is My Body" as meaning, "This hallowed food, through concurrence of Divine power, is in verity and truth, unto faithful receivers, *instrumentally a cause* of that mystical participation whereby, as I make Myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as My sacrificed Body can yield and as their souls do presently need" (*Eccl. Pol.* v. 67). But it is needless to proceed with quotations. "From the time of the Reformation to the present," says Bishop Harold Browne, "all the great luminaries of our Church have maintained the doctrine which appears on the face of our formularies, agreeing to deny a corporal and to acknowledge a spiritual feeding in the Supper of the Lord. It is scarcely necessary to recount the names of Mede, Andrewes, Hooker, Taylor, Hammond, Cosin, Bramhall, Usher, Pearson, Patrick, Bull, Beveridge, Wake, Waterland. All these have left us writings on the subject, and all have coincided, with a very slight diversity, in the substance of their belief" (*Exposition of the Articles*, Art. XXVIII. sec. 1).

Spiritual religion must have sunk to a very low ebb before the hypothesis of a carnal reception could have been adopted, and this we know was the case in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, when that tenet first sprang up and forced itself into the theology of the Western Church. The half-educated masses with whom it originated, whose feeble faith and gross mind could not lift themselves up to high and heavenly things, dragged down to the level of their own

vulgar conceptions the spiritual mystery which was delivered by the Master to His Church. Once having been debased, it was difficult indeed to lift it again out of the mire by which its wings were plastered down to the earth; for Superstition is by nature timorous, and when once a Divine character has been attributed to that which is not Divine, it shrinks with an exceeding dread from stripping it of its false character, and shudderingly calls such an act irreligious. It is not irreligious—it is an act of boldest, bravest, truest faith. It was not profanity, but faith, which led Hezekiah to remove the Brazen Serpent from the Temple. It was not irreligion, but enlightened zeal for God's worship, which made the Reformers of the sixteenth century break to pieces the images of Saints which had been made objects of popular adoration. And it was not irreligion, but faith, which, recurring to primitive doctrine, taught that His people were to feed on Christ, not by eating Him with the mouth under the form of bread, but by receiving Him into the soul, and there feeding upon Him as our true spiritual Food and Sustenance.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE idea of Incorporation with Christ is one that is common to the two Sacraments. In Baptism "we are made members of Christ;" by the Holy Communion we receive assurance of "being very members incorporate in the mystical Body of God's Son." The act of incorporation could not begin with the Holy Communion any more than remission of sins begins with it; but when by the initiatory Sacrament the ingrafting has been made, then in the second Sacrament we are first reassured as to the original incorporation having taken place, and remission of sins having been already given; and next, provided that we come with hearts duly qualified by faith and charity, we are still more intimately incorporated into the mystical Body, and we receive, on our repentance, remission of those sins which, in the daily course of our life, by our frailty we commit. Thus, in the Holy Communion there is, if we may so speak, an extension of that work of the Holy Spirit which belongs especially to Baptism, and also a joyous acknowledgment that that work has been wrought—that we are indeed members of Christ, and as such pardoned by and reconciled to our Heavenly Father.

Union with Christ is in part taught, in part effected, by Holy Communion. It is taught symbolically in it, as we

learn from St. Paul when he says, "For we being many are one Bread and one Body, for we are all partakers of one Bread" (1 Cor. x. 17). The one bread or loaf distributed among many was counted as symbolizing the unity which ought to exist among Christians numerically distinct. This idea is found very prominent in "The Teaching of the Apostles," where the Eucharistical prayer over the broken bread is represented as consisting solely of the following thanksgiving and supplication: "We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou madest known unto us through Jesus Thy Child. To Thee be the Glory for ever. As this Bread which we break was once scattered over the hills, and gathered together it became one, so may Thy Church be gathered from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom; for Thine is the glory and the power, through Jesus Christ for ever" (chap. ix.).

Besides teaching the lesson of unity, the Holy Communion was regarded as a means of bringing it about. As bread and wine become assimilated to the body, so Christ and the soul were considered by the Fathers to become interpenetrated each with the other by the solemn act of communion. Thus, St. Cyril of Alexandria writes, "By one Body, His own, blessing through the mystical communion those who believe in Him, He makes us incorporated with Himself and with one another. For who should separate and remove from a natural oneness one with another those who through the one Holy Body are bound up into oneness with Christ? For if we all partake of the one bread, we are all made one body; for Christ cannot be divided. Wherefore the Church is called also the Body of Christ, and we too are members in particular. . . . But if we are all concorporate one with

another in Christ, and not only with one another, but with Himself, in that He is in us through His own Flesh, now are we not all clearly one, both with each other and with Christ? For Christ is the bond of oneness, being in one, God and Man; and again, although in us being many, Christ giveth the Father's and His own Spirit to dwell in each of us, yet is He one and indivisible, holding together in oneness through Himself the spirits which in their several existences are severed from oneness, and making all to appear as one in Himself, for as the power of the Holy Flesh maketh those concorporate in whom it is, in like way, I deem, the one indivisible Spirit of God dwelling in all bringeth all together to the spiritual unity" (*In S. Johan Evan.* c. xvii., Dr. Pusey's translation). And so again: "Just as if any one having kneaded one piece of wax with another and melted them together with fire, one thing is made out of both; in like manner, through participation of the Body of Christ and of His precious Blood, He in us, and we again in Him, are made one" (*Ibid.* in c. xv.).

If the faithful communicant is united to Christ and incorporated into his Body, he must also be united at the same time with his brethren, who, together with himself, make up the mystical Body of Christ. Accordingly, we find in the Liturgy of St. Basil: "Do thou unite us all who are partakers of the one Bread and Cup to each other in the fellowship of the one Holy Ghost." And in the Liturgy, called by the name of St. Mark: "By the participation of Thy undefiled Body and Thy precious Blood, unite us to the company, altogether most blessed, that is well pleasing unto Thee." And in the Sacramentary of Leo: "We beseech Thee, Almighty God, that we may be numbered among the

members of Him of whose Body and Blood we are partakers."

This aspect of the Holy Communion, which had been obscured by the preachers of the doctrines of Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass, was again dwelt upon with emphasis at the Reformation. Cranmer writes, "As the bread and wine which we do eat be turned into our flesh and blood and be made our very flesh and very blood, and so be joined and mixed with our flesh and blood that they be made one whole body together, even so be all faithful Christians spiritually turned into the Body of Christ, and so be joined unto Christ, and also together among themselves, that they do make but one mystical Body of Christ; as St. Paul saith, 'We be one Bread and one Body as many as be partakers of that one Bread and one Cup'" (*Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*, bk. i. c. xiv.). And still earlier, in the *Institution of a Christian Man*, we find, "By the communion and participation of the Sacrament of the altar, we be inserted into the Body of Christ, and so we be incorporated in Christ, and Christ in us." And again, in the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man:* "As in the receiving of this Sacrament we have most entire communion with Christ, so be we also joined by the same in most perfect unity with the Church and all the members thereof." And so in the Second Book of Homilies: "Resorting to this Table, we must pluck up all the roots of infidelity, all distrust of God's promises, that we make ourselves living members of Christ's Body. For the unbelievers and faithless cannot feed on that precious Body; whereas the faithful have their life, their abiding in Him, their union, and, as it were, their

incorporation with Him" (*On the Worthy Receiving, etc.*, Part I.).

How Christians are combined together into the one Body of Christ by the Holy Ghost, which is at once the Spirit of Christ and of each and all of His members, is a mystery which we cannot penetrate. But we may believe that this effect is produced by His operation, as otherwise and elsewhere, so especially in the two Holy Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, wherein and whereby He is imparted to the souls of the faithful.

"We in the outward action," says Barrow, "partake of the symbols representing our Saviour's Body and Blood; we in the spiritual intention communicate of His very Person, being intimately united to Him" (*Doctrine of the Sacraments —The Eucharist*).

CHAPTER XXVII.

THERE is one other aspect in which we have still to regard the Holy Communion. The Church teaches us that it is not only a Remembrance, not only an Offering, not only a means of Feeding and of Incorporation, but also a Pledge. It is a pledge of something past, of something present, and of something future. In the past, of our forgiveness by God; in the present, of our favour with Him; in the future, of our obtaining the eternal inheritance.

It may be asked what *need* is there for any such pledge of God's graciousness in the past, in the present, or in the future? and *how* can a visible external sign, such as admission to God's table, serve to us as an assurance of His favour?

Now, with respect to the *need*, it may be freely conceded that the whole sacramental system is a *concessum propter infirmitatem*. We can imagine beings whose nature was such that they would not require sacraments at all—nay, we believe that our own nature will be such hereafter, when we no longer see through a glass darkly, but face to face, knowing as we are known. But the fact that they might not be required by beings constituted otherwise than we are is no argument against their use and necessity for us. Our spiritual natures are not so framed that we are conscious of each stage

and act in our growth and nourishment. We do not feel the growth even of our natural life. We look back and see that we have been born, and that we have grown; but birth and growth elude our notice as they occur, and in this respect the spiritual life is in most cases similar to that of the body. But it differs in this way—the natural life grows and grows, and we feel no anxiety about our birth and growth; but devotion is a tender, anxious thing; it fears that the spiritual growth, of which it is not each hour conscious, is not proceeding at all, and in this state of tremor a religious man thankfully accepts the external visible sign of being admitted to God's board as assurance—not evidence to unbelief, but assurance to humility—that he has been brought into God's kingdom, and made God's child, and that he is now in favour with Him, and may hope for His promised blessing hereafter. If God thus deigns to indicate to him that He is his Father, he feels a comforting assurance that he is His son. If God symbolically holds out to him the food of life, he believes that he receives at His hands the spiritual food symbolized. If God gives to him the Bread of Life, he believes that he will not die eternally.

As to the *how*—whatever Christ appointed as a pledge and sign of His love would be so regarded by His people for ever, just as the bow in the clouds, though arbitrarily selected, was a pledge of God's mercy; but we may see some special reason why Sacraments should serve as pledges while they are much more; for Sacraments are, as it were, the last link in the chain of assurances let down from heaven to earth to make man feel and know that he is truly united to God. The God revealed by natural science is a terrible power, inspiring awe and fear, far away from

any contact with man, who is unable to determine whether the ruler of the universe whom he contemplates be a person or a law. The God of the philosopher and of the non-Christian religions is not much nearer to man, although He has now become recognized as a Person, and as probably exercising the providential government of the world. Christianity teaches the union of God and man in the Person of Jesus Christ, and so the Divine nature touches the human nature, and the human nature the Divine. There is yet another step whereby God and man are brought nearer, when Christ, in whose Person the Divine nature exists, gives Himself to be mystically put on by man in one Sacrament, and to be mystically the spiritual food of man in the other. These sacraments, visible and external rites as they are, thus serve as a pledge of that union between God and himself that the soul of man longs after. They are not, they cannot be in themselves, demonstrative proofs of that union; they speak to faith, and to faith they are an assurance inexpressibly comforting and consoling. Hooker, with his usual breadth of view, takes in this as well as the other aspects of the Holy Communion. He writes, "This Supper is received as a seal unto us that we are His house and His sanctuary; that His Christ is as truly united to me, and I to Him, as my arm is united and knit into my shoulder; that He dwelleth in me as verily as the elements of bread and wine which are within me; which persuasion, by receiving these dreadful mysteries, we profess ourselves to have—a due comfort if truly, and if in hypocrisy, then woe worth us" (*Serm.* vi. 10).

Under the old Dispensation, a similar aid was extended to man's weakness by the Divine tenderness of mercy.

When the pious Jew ate of the sacrifice which had been offered as a peace-offering, he felt assured thereby that he had been admitted into covenant with God, and that he was at that time in the favour of God, who thus received him to partake of His board, and that the virtue of the sacrifice was imputed to him in all its far-reaching value; and in like manner the humble Christian, who comes in faith and love and self-distrust to the Holy Communion, feels himself assured of his sonship in Christ, of the forgiveness of his sins, and of his acceptance with God, and that he has an interest in the sacrifice of the broken Body and poured-out Blood by which the world was redeemed.

But this is not all, for Christ brought life and immortality to light, of which the Jew had no clear vision. Not only, therefore, is the Holy Communion a pledge to the Christian of his forgiveness by God, and of his being a living member of His kingdom on earth, but it is also an assurance of his future resurrection, and of his being heir to the eternal inheritance in the heavens.

In His discourse at Capernaum, our Lord unites very closely the doctrine that He is the Bread of Life with the doctrine of the Resurrection. Whoever ate that Bread, He taught, should not die, but should live for ever. "Whoso eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (John vi. 54). The humble believer coming to eat the Bread of Life in the manner appointed by Christ may therefore have a comforting assurance—not only for this life, but for the next—that Christ will, according to His promise, raise him up at the last day, and grant to him to live for ever with Him, provided, of course, that he continue throughout his life

eating of that Bread in faith and love, that is, feeding spiritually upon Him. Thus it is that the Holy Communion becomes the *viaticum* to the dying Christian; not that its mere physical and mechanical reception can profit anything either to soul or body, but that the spiritual feeding on Christ, symbolized and effected by the eating and drinking of the bread and wine, the outward means by which the inward reality is conveyed to the duly qualified soul, does so fill the faithful Christian with the life of Christ that the death of the body can have no material effect upon him. The life that he lives is already that eternal life over which the changes of the body have no power,—that life which the spiritual body, raised up at the last day, is to partake of, together with the soul, in the never-ending kingdom of God.

SUMMARY.

The Holy Communion is a Remembrance, a Sacrifice, a means of Feeding, a means of Incorporation, a Pledge.

It is a Remembrance in so far as its object is to recall to the minds of Christians the love of Christ as exhibited in the sacrifice of His death; in so far as it commemorates by an outward act that Divine sacrifice; and in so far as it is a memorial of Christ and His death before man and before God.

It is a Sacrifice, inasmuch as it is an offering made to God as an act of religious worship—a *spiritual* sacrifice, as being a sacrifice of prayer and praise to God for the benefits received by the sacrifice of the death of Christ; a *material* sacrifice, in so far as the bread and wine are regarded as

gifts of homage to God in acknowledgment of His creative and sustaining power; a *commemorative* sacrifice, inasmuch as it commemorates the great Sacrifice of the Cross—the words "commemorative sacrifice" meaning, in this acceptation, a commemoration of the sacrifice. But it is not a sacrifice of Christ to His Father, whereby God is propitiated and man's sins expiated.

It is a means of Feeding upon Christ; but this feeding is not effected by the elements to be eaten being changed into Christ—an hypothesis which grew up in the ninth century among a rude and uninstructed populace, forced its way into the theology of the Western Church in the eleventh century, although opposed to the tradition of the Church, the true interpretation of Scripture, and the tenets of philosophy—an hypothesis which has led to the practices of Reservation, Procession of the Sacrament, Elevation, Adoration, Communion in one kind, Fasting Reception (imposed as of necessity), and the belief that Christ's Body is eaten by the wicked.

Nor is our Feeding on Christ effected by our eating His material Body, together with the bread and wine, which is the theory of Consubstantiation.

But it is effected by the spiritual Presence of Christ, and the benefits of His blood-shedding on the Cross being conveyed to the soul of the humble recipient qualified by faith and love towards God and man.

It is a means of Incorporation, inasmuch as by it we are more and more made part of the mystical Body of Christ, and united with its other members.

It is a Pledge, inasmuch as it serves to the humble Christian as a symbolical assurance of God's past forgive-

ness, and of His present favour towards him, and of a future inheritance graciously reserved for him.

Remembrance, Sacrifice, Feeding, Incorporation, Pledge. Regard any one of these ideas as an adequate expression of the doctrine of the Holy Communion, and we shall have only a partial conception of it. Combine them, and we attain as nearly to a complete notion and apprehension of it as the nature of a mystery will admit.

CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX OF AUTHORS QUOTED, AND WHAT THEY TEACH.

SUPPLEMENTARY INDEX.

THE ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS LIMITED